DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 224 EC 090 492

AUTHOR Rossett, Allison
TITLE Parenting and the Exceptional Child. End-of-Project Evaluation Report, July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1976.
INSTITUTION Capitol Region Education Council, Bloomfield, Conn.
REPORT NO 16-75-1003
PUB DATE Jul 76
NOTE 118p.; For related information, see EC 090 491-493

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Exceptional Child Education; *Handicapped Children; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Parent Education; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Parenting and the Exceptional Child Project

ABSTRACT

Presented is the final report of the 2-year Connecticut "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" project, which provided approximately 100 professionals in the helping fields with training in leading parent groups concerned with managing the exceptional child in the home. Briefly reviewed are the project's five phases from initially familiarizing persons with the project to the project evaluation. Results of the field based evaluative study are given to include that major goals were met as shown in the expressed satisfaction of both parents and trainers. The final section, on the future of the program now that Title III funding has terminated, contains a list of dissemination activities such as possible distribution of materials by the National Center for Media and Materials for the Handicapped, the First Chance Early Childhood Network Closer Look, and the ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) system. The major portion of the document contains appendixes including summaries of orientation meetings for trainers, lists of agencies and organizations in Connecticut attending the training sessions, the observer rating schedule, the parent and trainer opinionaries, and an evaluative study of the longitudinal effect of the program. (DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125224

END-OF-PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

Parenting and the Exceptional Child

July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SUBMITTED BY

Allison Rossett, Ed. D.
Project Director
Parent Education Program
16-75-1003

Capitol Region Education Council
800 Cottage Grove Road, Bldg. 2
Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002

July 1, 1976

EC 090 492

Introduction to the Final Report

The Final Report of the "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" project examines two years of efforts and accomplishments of the project in light of the proposed activities and goals detailed in the proposals. Emphasis is placed on the work of the second (and final) year of the project. Reference is made to the Final Report of the first fiscal year of the project where appropriate.

The Final Report is presented in three sections:

I. Report on Projected and Accomplished Activities by Allison Rossett, Project Director.

II. A Field Based Evaluative Study of Selected Goals of the CREC Parent Education Program: "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" by Linda Cook, Evaluator.

III. The Future of the Program by Allison Rossett.

I. Report on Projected and Accomplished Activities

The Projected Activities section of the Continuation Proposal for "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" is specific about those activities considered necessary to carry out the goals of this project. In general, the second year has been directed towards the realization of two major purposes: more extensive dissemination and more intensive evaluation.* The activities which are described below relate directly to these major thrusts.

Based on feedback from the State Title III Evaluation Team (Barbara MacDonald and Claire Gold), projected activities for the project were selected and placed in five phases with continuous elements uniting the phases. All efforts were directed towards making more persons familiar with the program, training more persons to use the program and examining more closely the impact of the program on the parents and trainers who use it.

PHASE I:

During this phase, all six Regional Educational Service Centers (RESCs) were familiarized with the project through letters, phone calls and personal contacts. Major orientation sessions to the program were held at CREC and at ACES, and RESC personnel and selected trainers were encouraged to attend.

One orientation session was held at CREC; two were held at ACES. Additional sessions were also held at Southern Connecticut State College and the Avon Public Schools. A total of 144 persons were initially exposed to the program through an orientation session. The percentage of those attending from the RESCs follows:

ACES	CES	CREC	LEARN
11%	6%	19%	15%

and 49% from other agencies in Connecticut.

At each orientation session, great emphasis was placed on careful selection of the trainer. RESC and other agency personnel were cautioned to carefully examine pages 6-8 in the Trainer's Manual when selecting a trainer or self-evaluating themselves as potential trainers. See Appendix A for a brief description of the orientation meeting.

*The first year of the project focused on needs assessment, program development and limited trainer training and evaluation.

During initial phases of the project, information on and materials related to the program were distributed to the RESCs and to interested agencies in Connecticut.* Five programs were sent to each RESC; 10 Resource Directories were distributed to each RESC; 1 program was distributed to each of 5 agencies; and 1 Resource Directory was distributed to 75 agencies, school districts, and special education program personnel in the state of Connecticut.

PHASE II:

The initial orientation and training sessions called for in Phase II were accomplished during November and December of 1975 and January of 1976. At the first training session, trainers were familiarized with the genesis of the program, its uses during the past fiscal year and the results of evaluation of the program during its first year. Trainers were also told that they would be expected to attend two more training sessions, to gather a group of parents of exceptional children and to participate in the program evaluation conducted by Ms. Linda Cook. Additional details from the training sessions are included in Appendix A.

Three first training sessions were held: one at CREC, one at ACES and one in Westport. Forty-three persons attended the first training session at CREC; 10 persons attended the first training session at ACES; and 5 persons attended in Westport for a total of 58 potential trainers.

At this first training session, an interesting result of the program began to emerge. While the program is designed as an instructional tool for teachers to use with parents, it is clearly an attractive strategy for social workers and guidance counselors. The following chart indicates the use of the program by persons in various professional roles. Special attention should be paid to the number of teachers extending their role and interests outside of the classroom and into work with parents and the number of social workers extending their focus into making the home a more effective learning environment for exceptional children.

Professional Roles	Number Trained
Teachers	26
Social Workers	12
Administrators	9
Counselors	8
Parents	2
Librarians	1
Total	58

*Appendix B includes a list of Connecticut agencies which were involved with the "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" project.

One of the suggestions offered by Ms. Linda Cook in last year's evaluation report was that behavior modification training and programming, while important, should be structured as a separate, voluntary, special interest segment of the program. While trainers were encouraged to assist parents in using these procedures, they were directed to teach and implement with parents in individual or satellite sessions. Living with Children by Gerald Patterson, Parents are Teachers by Wesley Becker and "Behavior Modification for Parents of Exceptional Children", a chapter in the Trainer's Manual by William Heward, were all discussed and suggested to the trainers. Therefore, based on the Cook suggestion and the shortage of time, specific training in behavior modification was not included as a part of trainer training sessions.

PHASE III:

Phase III was accomplished as described in the Continuation Proposal. Appendix A includes highlights of the second training sessions. Fifty-six persons attended the second training sessions at the various locations. A total of 56 attended both training sessions; 28 persons embarked upon efforts to interest parents in participating in a group led by them and using the program. Twenty-one groups were formed with 19 co-trainers, of whom 3 have copies of the program. Four others (trained persons) have copies of the program and plan to start groups in the Fall of 1976.

PHASE IV:

The final training sessions were directed towards trainers who had already begun work with groups of parents. These sessions involved 24 trainers. While the majority of those in attendance had begun training parents with the program, some in attendance were still attempting to gather a group of willing parents. This highlights a universal problem in parent education: the less than optimal participation of parents in work with educators to improve the instruction of their children. Trainers were directed to page 19 of the Trainer's Manual. This page offers suggestions for increasing parent participation.

Trainers at the final training sessions were used as resources for each other. Those who had worked with parents indicated issues, concerns and opportunities evoked by the stimulus visuals. The Project Director and the more experienced trainers then suggested strategies to increase the effectiveness of the program. Neophyte trainers indicated that this session was of tremendous use to them.

PHASE V:

Ms. Linda Cook, evaluator of the impact of the program with parents and trainers, prepared parent, trainer and observer opinionnaires to provide data on the statewide response

to the program. This data is presented, analyzed and discussed in Part II of this Final Report.

A controlled comparison of the uses of the program as a tool for group vs. individual work with parents was not undertaken. However, interaction with trainers as they used the program suggests their response to this question. Out of a total of 56 trained individuals, 40 are working with 21 parent groups, and at least 10 trainers indicated use of the program with individual parents. They expressed satisfaction with the visuals and with the portions of the Manual devoted to use of the visuals with individual parents. One trainer said, "It gave me a handle on areas of concern to parents and specific ways of getting into them with parents." It seems that the program can be used effectively as either a group or individual tool.

The following chart displays the number of orientation training sessions, persons trained and programs distributed and used.

	CREC		ACES		
	Meeting #1	Meeting #2	Meeting #1	Meeting #2	TOTALS
Orientation	47		38	14	99
First Training Session	43		10	5	58
Second Training Session	42		14		56
Third Training Session	14	5	5		24
# of Trainers (Attended both sessions I & II)	24		16		40
Received copy of Program	20		8		28

Held Parent Groups	CREC	ACES	LEARN	CES	TOTALS
Group leaders	14	1	4	2	21
Co-trainers	10	2	6	1	19

Continuous Elements:

The Resource Directory, as one component of the program, was given to each of the trainers (30), the RESCs (30) and the Special Education Resource Center (10) early in 1976. Additional requests for the Resource Directory as an entity separate from the media program led to a second printing of the Directories to be distributed in the following way:

Given out with the Program in first printing	70
6 RESCs (5 copies each)	30
CREC - Director of Special Education Programs	5
- METRO and In-Service Training	5
- School Superintendents, Directors of Pupil and Personnel Services and Special Education, and Special Education Program Directors	85
- Parent Education Program Advisory Committee	25
Special Education Resource Center	10
Review copies for National Dissemination	5
Copies for future distribution	15
	250 copies

Personnel at the RESCs were encouraged to make the Resource Directory available to their participating institutions.

Through the generosity of the Department of Library Development of the Connecticut State Library, enough copies of the Directory were reproduced by them for distribution to each of the 169 Connecticut public libraries, and permission was given to patrons to copy any or all parts of the Directory as needed.

The Special Education Resource Center received 10 additional Directories. Because of their funding to prepare a directory during the Summer of 1976, it seems likely that SERC will update and continue dissemination of this Resource Directory. All suggestions for inclusions and/or changes in the Directory are being forwarded to them for this purpose.

The program has an audience which extends far beyond the boundaries of the state of Connecticut.* Because of an article by the Project Director in Teaching Exceptional Children, Summer 1976, and a speech at the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Special Education and Technology meeting, 95 letters and phone calls have been received from individuals, schools and agencies in and out of the state of Connecticut. A list of out-of-state organizations/agencies/schools contacting the project is included in Appendix C. Appendix D is a list of out-of-state university and student requests for the program. Appendix E contains State of Connecticut requests for information.

The Project Director has submitted the program and evaluation data to the National Center for Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped (NCEMMH). They are currently examining it to determine whether or not they will make it available for national distribution.

*Appendix F is a statement of the dissemination policy for the program.

The Project Director has also responded to requests from Closer Look, The First Chance Network and Early Years-Parent. The latter magazine has solicited at least one article about the program. In order to increase public familiarity with the program, the Project Director has asked Dr. Terry Lawrence of Southern Connecticut State College and Ms. Linda Cook of the University of Massachusetts to consider reviewing the program for national and regional newsletters and magazines. They have responded positively to this suggestion.

The activities described above reflect the project personnel's efforts to familiarize persons with the program, train selected individuals to use this program, evaluate the impact of the program and establish on-going mechanisms to assure that the program and its work will continue after funding for the project has terminated.

II. A Field Based Evaluative Study of Selected Goals of the CREC Parent Education Program: "Parenting and the Exceptional Child"

Prepared by

Linda L. Cook

Laboratory of Psychometric and Evaluative Research
School of Education
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Preface

The second year of implementation of the Capitol Region Education Council (CREC) "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" program has recently been completed. The initial implementation occurred in Spring of 1975 during which three special education programs under the auspices of CREC took part. The second year of implementation, occuring in the Spring of 1976, involved a total of 17 programs located in Connecticut, ten of which were selected for evaluation.

The present evaluative study is concerned mainly with the effectiveness of the second year of the program. However, results of the evaluation of the initial year of the program (Rossett, 1975) as well as the evaluation of the longitudinal effects of that initial year (Cook, 1976) have been incorporated into the report in order to provide a comprehensive description of program effectiveness.

The evaluation would not have been possible without the generous assistance of Ms. Joyce Hubbard, training associate, Ms. Cathy Hussey, secretary, support staff at CREC, and the program trainers. The program evaluator would like to express sincere thanks to those mentioned above, whose kind cooperation greatly facilitated the evaluation.

Table of Contents for Section II

		Page
I.	Statement of Project Objectives and Evaluation Techniques Used	1
	A. A Brief Description of the "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" Program	1
	B. Statement of the Purpose of the Evaluation	1
	C. Experimental Design	2
	D. Instrumentation	2
	1. Parent Education Program Observer Rating Schedule	2
	2. Parent Education Program Parent Opinionnaire	3
	3. Parent Education Program Trainer Opinionnaire	4
II.	Description of Evaluation Population	5
III.	Evaluation Process and Sequence	5
	A. Administration of Data Collection Instruments	5
	B. Limitations of the Methodology	5
IV.	Results	6
	A. Parent Education Program Observer Rating Schedule	6
	B. Parent Education Program Parent Opinionnaire	8
	C. Parent Education Program Trainer Opinionnaire	11
	D. Longitudinal Evaluation of Spring 1975 Implementation	14
V.	Analysis and Conclusions	15
	References	17

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Summary of Responses to Parent Education Program Observer Rating Schedule	7
2.	Summary of Responnes to Parent Education Program Parent Opinionnaire	9
3.	Summary of Responses to Parent Education Program Trainer Opinionnaire	12

I. Statement of Project Objectives and Evaluation Techniques Used

A. A Brief Description of the "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" Program

The development of the program was made possible through an ESEA, Title III grant to the Capitol Region Education Council. The program materials were developed by Dr. Allison Rossett in consultation with parents and educators of exceptional children. The program consists of 45 transparencies and a print trainer's manual and is designed to provide a mediated approach to parent education for parents of children with special needs. The visuals are open-ended: they depict parents and children in natural interactions and leave these interactions unresolved. Trainers and parents then utilize the statements, actions and feelings evoked by the transparencies to bring about desired changes in parenting behaviors. The visuals are accompanied by a detailed trainer and resource manual. Each visual is individually treated; suggested questions, activities and resources relevant to the issue highlighted in the visual are provided. An extensive resource directory is included as part of the parent training program.

B. Statement of the Purpose of the Evaluation

The major goals of the CREC program, "Parenting and the Exceptional Child", are as follows:

- To encourage parents to gather with other parents of exceptional children.
- To stimulate discussion of the nature and impact of exceptionality on the parents of exceptional children.
- To encourage discussion of the parents' feelings about being the parents of exceptional children.
- To use this affective discussion to stimulate parent request for cognitive information about their child's exceptionality.
- To organize and systematize parents serving as resources for each other in effective parenting and learning within the home.
- To suggest options for parenting behaviors in response to the demands of various exceptionalities.
- To familiarize parents with local, state and national resources for parents of exceptional children.

The major problem in the evaluation of any educational program is the development of a methodology that can provide information for decision making about the

program. According to Stufflebeam, et. al. (1971), the steps that must be accomplished to develop such a methodology are:

(1) Definition of program objectives;

(2) Selection or development of instruments to measure the attainment of program objectives;

(3) Selection of an experimental design that is appropriate for providing the desired information;

(4) Development of a system for reporting the information provided by the evaluation.

Since steps one through four were accomplished as part of the evaluation of the Spring 1975 program implementation, a major focus of this year's evaluation has been upon the revision and refinement of the instruments and evaluative techniques previously used.

C. Experimental Design

The experimental design utilized in this study is known as a static group design (Campbell and Stanley, 1966). The design consists of making observations on previously existing experimental groups at the end of an educational experience. The choice of this design was dictated by two constraints. First, it was impossible to randomly choose parents for the educational program; thus, previously existing intact groups had to be utilized. Second, due to time and financial constraints, it was impossible to pretest parents on the various program goals.

D. Instrumentation

1. Parent Education Program Observer Rating Schedule

The development of the Parent Education Program Observer Rating Schedule was based on an environmental rating method designed by Bourque (1974). This rating schedule (used for the Spring 1975 evaluation) was revised for the present evaluation in the following manner:

a. A request that the observer wait until the meeting has been in progress for 30 minutes prior to implementation of the rating schedule was added to the introductory paragraph. It was found last year that behaviors changed considerably during the opening minutes of the meeting and did not stabilize sufficiently to be accurately observed until approximately 30 minutes after the meeting had begun.

b. A scale was added to assess frequency as well as quality of behavior. It was apparent from last year's evaluation that the scale used did not

adequately differentiate between frequency of behavior and quality of behavior. It was believed that a more valid assessment of behavior would be possible if these two dimensions were rated separately.

c. The "insufficient information" category was found unnecessary last year and thus was removed from this year's rating schedule.

d. Items relating to role rehearsal and behavior modification (Section I, items 8 and 9 and Section III, items 6 and 7) were removed. It became apparent from last year's evaluation that these techniques were not being implemented for various reasons. It was decided by the program director to either eliminate them from the program this year or to develop subgroups of parents for the purpose of dealing specifically with behavior modification or role rehearsal.

e. Section IV, item 1 was eliminated because it did not solicit useful information last year. Parents found it too difficult to recall their reactions to specific transparencies and could not identify the few transparencies they did recall in a manner that was meaningful to the evaluator or the project director.

The revised rating schedule consists of 6 items assessing the effectiveness of the trainer, 3 items evaluating the effect of the transparencies, 4 items assessing the parents' reactions to the meetings and 4 free response items soliciting the observer's reactions to the meeting in general.

Copies of the original and revised Observer Rating Schedule are presented in Appendix G.

2. Parent Education Program Parent Opinionnaire

The development of the Spring 1975 Parent Education Program Parent Opinionnaire was based on methodologies discussed by Miller (1970). The following revisions were made to this instrument before it was utilized in the present evaluation:

a. Section I, item 7 was eliminated because it did not solicit data that was useful to the previous evaluation.

b. Section I, item 7 was added because it was suspected last year that the program might be more appropriate for parents of children with some types of handicaps than for other parents. It was therefore thought necessary to determine parental satisfaction in relation to their child's specific handicap.

c. Section III, item 4 was eliminated for the same reason given for elimination of Section IV, item 1 of the Observer Rating Schedule.

d. Section III, item 4 was added because the evaluator gained the impression, from last year's evaluation, that the transparencies were more relevant to some handicaps than others and wanted to have the opportunity to substantiate this impression.

e. Section VI, items 1-6 were eliminated because they deal with behavior modification techniques. The rationale for this elimination has been given previously.

The revised Parent Opinionnaire consists of 7 items soliciting background information for the study, 8 items assessing the parents' opinions of the meetings, 4 items assessing the parents' opinions of the transparencies, 7 items evaluating the affective aspects of the meetings, 6 items assessing the parents' opinions of the Resource Directory, and 4 items assessing the parents' opinions of the program trainer.

Copies of the original and revised instrument are presented in Appendix H.

3. Parent Education Program Trainer Opinionnaire

The development of the Parent Education Program Trainer Opinionnaire, used in the 1975 evaluation, was based on methodologies discussed by Miller (1970). This opinionnaire was revised in the following manner:

a. Section II, items 8 and 9 were eliminated. The rationale for these eliminations has been previously given.

b. Section III, item 5 was eliminated for the same reason that Section IV, item 1 was eliminated from the Observer Rating Schedule.

c. Section III, item 5 was added to aid in the determination of the relevance of the transparencies to specific handicaps. The rationale for this has been previously mentioned.

d. Section IV, items 8-10 were eliminated because they deal with behavior modification techniques.

e. Section IV, items 8 and 9 were added because it was apparent from last year's evaluation that parents were not using the Resource Directory and it was felt that it would be useful to ascertain if they were being adequately exposed to it.

The revised Trainer Opinionnaire consists of 5 items assessing the trainers' opinions of the training sessions, 9 items assessing the trainers' opinions of the Parent Education Program Manual, 5 items assessing the trainers' opinions of the program transparencies, 7 items assessing the trainers' opinions of the effect of the program on the

parents and 2 items soliciting information concerning the Resource Directory.

Copies of the original and revised instrument are presented in Appendix I.

II. Description of Evaluation Population

The sample consisted of 70 parents of exceptional children enrolled in educational facilities within the state of Connecticut. These parents were semi-urban residents of mixed ethnic and racial background. Twenty percent (20%) of the parents categorized their child's handicap as physical, 42% as intellectual, 13% as emotional and 25% as "other". The "other" category included such handicaps as minimal brain disfunction and learning disabilities. Thirty percent (30%) of the parents participating in the program were male and 70% female. Forty percent (40%) of the parents were in the 26-35 year age group. The average number of children per family was 2.9. Eighty-six percent (86%) of the families had one handicapped child and 14% had two handicapped children. The average age of the handicapped child was 7.6. Twenty-nine percent (29%) of the handicapped children were pre-school age.

The parents were members of ten separate parent groups, each being facilitated by a staff member indigenous to the particular program.

III. Evaluation Process and Sequence

A. Administration of Data Collection Instruments

Parent Opinionnaires were administered to the group by the trainer. These instruments were administered at the beginning of the final meeting to avoid possible biasing effects of the content of that particular meeting. Trainers responded to the Trainer Opinionnaire at the same time parents were responding to the Parent Opinionnaire.

Five parent groups were randomly selected for observation. Data for the Parent Education Program Observer Rating Schedule was collected during the third meeting of each of these parent groups. The observation required approximately 1-1/2 hours/group. The observer was a member of the Laboratory for Psychometric and Evaluative Research who has had experience observing parent groups concerned with physically handicapped children in Massachusetts and New Jersey.

B. Limitations of the Methodology

Some of the limitations of the evaluation were inherent in the static group design. The major limitation

was lack of randomness of the parent sample. Because of this limitation, generalizations to a population of all parents of all handicapped children must be made with extreme caution.

Another limitation was that the resources available for the evaluation were not sufficient to enable an extensive validation of the data collection instruments. Thus, one cannot be absolutely sure that the instruments measured what they were intended to measure. However, it can be said that all of the instruments used have a high degree of face validity (Cronbach, 1971).

Because of the above listed limitations, the results of the evaluation should be interpreted with caution. However, it should be noted that these results basically confirmed the findings of the evaluation of the year one (Spring 1975) implementation of the program and can therefore be viewed to have a certain degree of validity.

IV. Results

A. Parent Education Program Observer Rating Schedule

An examination of the data summarized in Table 1 indicates that no behavior was considered to be either completely lacking or of inferior quality. The following four behaviors occurred frequently or very frequently and were of good or exceptional quality 100% of the time:

(1) the trainer stimulates discussion effectively; (2) the trainer appears comfortable in his/her role; (3) the trainer is flexible; and (4) the transparencies stimulate parental response. Further examination of the data indicates that 80% of the time the following five behaviors occurred frequently or very frequently and were evaluated to be of good or exceptional quality: (1) the trainer encourages parents to express their personal feelings related to the problems they have as parents of exceptional children; (2) the parents appear interested in the meeting; (3) the parents seem comfortable and at ease with the meeting; (4) the parents express their personal feelings; and (5) the parents interact with each other. Behavior 2, Section II (parents could relate their own experiences to the transparencies) was judged to occur occasionally 40% of the time, frequently 40% of the time and very frequently 20% of the time. The quality of this behavior was judged to be exceptional 60% of the time. Behavior 3 of Section II (parental response to the transparencies is spontaneous) was judged to occur frequently or very frequently 80% of the time and to be of quality good or exceptional 60% of the time. Behaviors 3 and 4 of Section I (the trainer displays the transparencies effectively, and the trainer paces the discussion effectively) were judged to occur frequently or very frequently 100% of the time and to be of good or better

Table 1

Summary of Responses to Parent Education Program Observer Rating Schedule

Section	Item No.	Response* (N=5)							
		frequency of behavior				quality of behavior			
		comp. lack.	occas.	freq.	very freq.	inferior	accept.	good	except.
I.	1.	0	0	60	40	0	0	60	40
	2.	0	0	40	60	0	0	40	60
	3.	0	0	60	40	0	20	40	40
	4.	0	0	60	40	0	40	20	40
	5.	0	0	60	40	0	0	40	60
	6.	0	20	20	60	0	20	20	60
II.	1.	0	0	60	40	0	20	20	60
	2.	0	40	40	20	0	20	20	60
	3.	0	20	40	40	0	40	20	40
III.	1.	0	20	20	60	0	20	20	60
	2.	0	20	40	40	0	20	40	40
	3.	0	20	20	60	0	20	40	40
	4.	0	20	20	60	0	20	20	60

*Responses are given in percentages.

quality 80% of the time.

Comparisons of the results of the present study with those of the previous year must be interpreted with some caution. The reason being that the percentages computed for the earlier evaluation were based on a sample of 3 and are therefore less stable than those computed for the present evaluation.

The Spring 1975 evaluation indicated that the following three aspects of the parent meetings were deemed to be of quality inferior for the purpose of the meeting: (1) the trainer's encouragement of parent-parent interaction; (2) the parents' ability to relate their own experiences to the transparencies; and (3) the parents' feeling of being comfortable and at ease with the meeting. The first behavior was not assessed with this year's instrument so no direct comparison can be made. The second behavior, although assessed (during the present evaluation) to occur less frequently than any other behavior, was judged to be of acceptable or better quality 100% of the time during the present evaluation as compared to the judgement of inferior quality 33.3% of the time and exceptional quality 66.6% of the time during the Spring 1975 evaluation. For both the Spring 1975 evaluation and the present evaluation the following two behaviors were judged to be of good or exceptional quality: (1) the trainer stimulates discussion effectively; and (2) the trainer appears comfortable in his/her role. No major differences were detected among the remaining 9 behaviors assessed by this year's instrument and comparable behaviors assessed by the previous year's instrument.

B. Parent Education Program Parent Opinionnaire

The results of the Parent Education Program Parent Opinionnaire are summarized in Table 2.

Analysis of the data indicates that 70% or more of the parents felt that the following items were true: (1) Section II, items 1, 2, 3, and 4; (2) Section III, item 3; and (3) Section IV, items 1, 2, 3 and 6. A "true" response to these items indicates that the parents believe the following: (1) the meetings were more valuable than most other types of parent meetings they had attended; (2) the meetings helped them to become a better parent to their exceptional child; (3) they would recommend meetings of this type to a friend or relative who is the parent of an exceptional child; (4) they were sorry the meetings had ended; (5) they thought the transparencies were a good way to get the conversation going; (6) the meetings had helped them realize that parents of exceptional children could be a great help to each other; (7) they thought they could be of valuable help to parents of exceptional children because of the experiences they had with their own child; (8) parents who

Table 2

Summary of Responses to Parent Education Program Parent Opinionnaire; Sections II, III, IV*

Section	Item No.	Response** (N=70)		
		True	False	Unsure
II.	1.	78	8	14
	2.	81	15	6
	3.	94	3	3
	4.	85	5	10
	5.	3	96	1
III.	1.	66	23	11
	2.	33	50	17
	3.	78	7	15
	4.	52	21	27
IV.	1.	93	1	6
	2.	75	1	24
	3.	96	0	4
	4.	31	55	4
	5.	42	42	16
	6.	76	9	15
	7.	58	31	11
V.	2.	42	25	33
	3.	65	28	7

*The following items are summarized in the results section of the report.

**Responses are given in percentages.

had attended the meetings actively shared with each other their feelings and ideas about parenting an exceptional child; and (9) as a result of the meetings they found it easier to cope with the problems related to being the parent of an exceptional child. Only one item received a response of "false" from 70% or more of the parents. This was item 5 of Section II. A response of "false" to this item indicates that the parents did not find the meetings boring.

The parents' responses to Section III, item 2 and Section IV, items 4, 5 and 7 were fairly well divided between "true" and "false", indicating that no clear cut decision can be made about the following aspects of the program: (1) the parents found the transparencies easy to relate to their own personal experiences; (2) the transparencies were relevant to the problems encountered with the handicap specific to the individual parent's child; (3) parents discussed their feelings more about being the parent of an exceptional child now as a result of the meetings; and (4) as a result of the meetings, parents exchange their feelings about parenting an exceptional child more with their spouses.

Responses to item 4 of Section III and items 2 and 3 of Section V indicate that parents feel quite positive about the following aspects of the program: (1) it was easier for them to express their feelings about parenting an exceptional child during the final few meetings than during the first few meetings; (2) the information contained in the Resource Directory was of use to them; and (3) they know more about local, state and national resources available to them than they did before they began attending the meetings.

Responses to items 1-4 of Section VI indicate the following: (1) 75% of the parents felt that the trainer gave satisfactory answers when asked specific questions relating to their child's handicap; (2) 95% of the parents felt that the trainer respected points of view other than his/her own; and (3) 59% of the parents felt the trainer was effective in encouraging reticent parents to contribute to the conversation at meetings.

Almost all parents listed the aspect of the meetings that they liked most as being able to meet and exchange ideas and feelings with other parents of exceptional children. They emphasized that the opportunity helped ameliorate the feeling of being alone with a difficult problem to cope with. Others cited the cognitive information they had gained as an important aspect of the meetings. Still others felt that they had learned more to express their personal feelings and to view themselves as important resource people to other parents of exceptional children. None of the parents mentioned any specific dislikes about the meetings.

Suggestions for improving the meetings were made mainly by parents with pre-school children and those who were parenting children with learning disabilities. These parents felt that the program could be improved by including more transparencies that dealt directly with pre-schoolers and children with learning disabilities.

Fairly close agreement was obtained between most of the item responses for the year one and year two evaluations. A few exceptions exist and should be noted. Parents involved in the year two implementation of the program appeared to feel more strongly that the meetings had been more valuable to them than other types of parent meetings they had attended. They also felt more strongly about the meetings helping them to become better parents of exceptional children than did parents involved in the first year of the program implementation. Thirty-three percent (33%) of the parents involved in the present evaluation felt that the meetings could have been conducted just as well without the transparencies, whereas none of the parents involved in the year one implementation felt this way. Forty-two percent (42%) of the parents involved in the present evaluation felt that they discussed their personal feelings about being the parent of an exceptional child more as a result of the meetings, whereas only 18.2% of the parents evaluated in spring 1975 felt this way. Parents involved in the present evaluation also felt more strongly that as a result of the meetings, they were able to cope with problems related to being the parents of an exceptional child than did those involved in the previous evaluation.

C. Parent Education Program Trainer Opinionnaire

The reader is referred to Table 3 for a summary of the responses to the Parent Education Program Trainer Opinionnaire.

The results of the opinionnaire analysis indicate that 70% or more of the trainers felt that the following items were true: (1) Section I, item 1; (2) Section II, items 1, 6 and 7; (3) Section III, item 3; and (4) Section IV, item 7. A "true" response to these items indicates that the trainers believed the following: (1) the training sessions were good preparation to act as facilitator at the parent meetings; (2) the manual was helpful in planning the meetings; (3) the manual was written in clear, easy to understand language; (4) the suggestions for use of the transparencies were helpful; (5) the transparencies were an effective means of stimulating parents' responses; and (6) even the most reticent parents were expressing their personal feelings by the final meetings.

The following four items received a response of "false" by 70% or more of the trainers: (1) Section II, item 8; (2) Section III, item 4; (3) Section IV, items 5 and 6. A "false" response to these items indicates the

Table 3

Summary of Responses to Parent Education Program Trainer Opinionnaire*

Section	Item No.	Response** (N=15)		
		True	False	Unsure
I.	1.	84	8	8
	2.	31	46	23
	3.	54	46	0
	4.	46	39	15
II.	1.	92	0	8
	2.	58	9	33
	3.	31	69	0
	4.	33	59	8
	5.	59	33	8
	6.	100	0	0
	7.	92	0	8
	8.	17	75	8
III.	1.	50	10	40
	2.	27	46	27
	3.	83	0	17
	4.	17	83	0
	5.	67	8	25
IV.	3.	54	31	15
	4.	34	58	8
	5.	0	92	8
	6.	25	75	0
	7.	84	8	8

*The following items are summarized in the results section of the report; Section I, item 5; Section II, item 9; Section IV, items 1, 2, 8, 9 and 10.

**Responses are given in percentages.

following: (1) the manual suggestions for the use of transparencies helped stimulate discussion; (2) the parents were not bored by the use of the transparencies; (3) the parents were not bored by the meetings; and (4) a few talkative parents did not dominate the conversation at most of the meetings.

The remaining item responses are not as clearly interpretable as those discussed above. The following four items received a fairly close number of "true" and "false" responses: (1) Section I, items 2, 3 and 4; and (2) Section III, item 2. Therefore, no definite statement can be made about the trainers' feelings concerning the following aspects of the program: (1) the importance of the training program in relation to the trainers' preparation to conduct the meeting; (2) the amount of preparation to conduct the meetings provided by the training sessions; (3) whether or not it would have been difficult to conduct the meetings without having participated in the training sessions; and (4) whether or not the parents found the transparencies confusing.

The responses to items 2 and 5 of Section II and item 3, Section IV, indicate that the trainers seemed to feel fairly positive about the following aspects of the program: (1) the manual was helpful in conducting the meetings; (2) the manual helped them (the trainers) gain insight into the problems of parents of exceptional children and (3) parents definitely shared their ideas and feelings with each other more during the final few meetings than they did during the earlier meetings.

Responses to two other items are important to note. First, the response to item 1 of Section III. This item deals with the parents' ability to relate their own experiences to the transparencies. Fifty percent (50%) of the trainers responded "true", however 40% were unsure. Second, item 5 of Section III which deals with the relevancy of the transparencies to the type of handicap represented by the group. Sixty-seven percent (67%) of the trainers responded "true" to this item but again a considerable percentage of the trainers (25%) responded "unsure".

Suggestions for improving the training sessions were as follows: (1) involve parents in practice sessions; (2) one to one sessions for trainers in addition to group training; (3) supply trainers with program materials during training sessions; (4) provide an opportunity for each trainer to practice with a transparency during training sessions; (5) more discussion of the transparencies; (6) make the books that were required reading more readily available to the trainers; and (7) more role playing sessions.

The following suggestions were made for improving the manual: (1) more guidelines for structuring the discussions; (2) books referenced in the manual should be readily avail-

able to the trainer; and (3) include more from Parents are Teachers.

Responses to items in Section IV indicated the following: (1) 38.5% of the trainers responded that more than 1/2 the parents requested specific information about their child's handicap; (2) 82% of the trainers felt they were "almost always" able to answer the parents' questions adequately; (3) 54% of the trainers felt that the parents definitely shared their ideas and feelings with each other more during the final few meetings than they did during the earlier meetings; (4) 54% said they had discussed the Resource Directory with the parents; (5) 84% said the parents had not familiarized themselves with the Resource Directory; and (6) 85% said they would recommend the program to a friend or relative with a handicapped child.

The reader is again cautioned that comparisons of the results of the present evaluation with those of the previous year must be interpreted with caution due to the instability of the percentages computed for the responses of the small number of trainers (3) participating in the Spring 1975 evaluation.

In general, there was reasonably close agreement between most of the responses to the items for the present evaluation and the Spring 1975 evaluation. The following differences are important enough to mention: (1) trainers who were part of the second year evaluation felt more strongly that the training sessions were good preparation to act as facilitators at the parent meetings; (2) only 50% of the trainers involved in the year two implementation felt that the parents found it easy to relate their own experiences to the transparencies whereas 100% of the trainers participating in the year one evaluation felt that this was the case; and (3) 100% of the trainers participating in the year one evaluation felt that they could see a change in the willingness of parents to express their personal feelings from the first to the last meeting whereas only 58% of the trainers involved in the year two implementation were willing to make this statement.

D. Longitudinal Evaluation of Spring 1975 Implementation

The purpose of the longitudinal evaluation was to determine if, relative to the stated goals, the "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" program had a lasting effect on participants' behavior.

The sample consisted of 13 parents (37%) who had participated in the initial implementation of the program. A mail survey technique was used for data collection. The results indicated that the program had a positive and lasting effect on parents who regularly attended the meetings and that these parents considered the meetings valuable and would like to have the opportunity of attending

similar meetings in the future. A copy of the longitudinal evaluation report is presented in Appendix J.

V. Analysis and Conclusions

The data indicates that the major goals of the "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" program were met. The parents who participated in the program felt that meeting with other parents of exceptional children was a valuable experience. Many reported that attending the meetings helped them learn to cope better with problems involving parenting an exceptional child. Responses expressing sorrow that the meetings had ended and a willingness to recommend this type of meeting to friends or relatives with exceptional children are strong indications of parental satisfaction with the program.

The following responses to an item of the Parent Opinionnaire which asked parents what they liked most about the meetings are further evidence of parental satisfaction and accomplishment of the program goals:

> "I cannot say enough about this program. The trainer, the teacher, the school system have contributed greatly to the change in behavior of my child. When I look back to the beginning of the year, the improvement I see today is amazing."
>
> "The meetings helped me know I wasn't alone. Also, knowing more about my child's handicap gave me more hope for her future."
>
> "Open group discussion with other parents. Much knowledge was gotten from open exchange of ideas and experiences. Many anxieties were eased by these discussions."

Although the Observer Rating Schedule did not detect the following result, both trainers and parents involved in this year's program seemed to feel less strongly about the relevancy of the transparencies than did those who participated in the program last year. The reason for this is probably due to the fact that a higher percentage of parents with pre-school children and children with handicaps that were classified as "other" participated in this year's program. Fifty-four percent (54%) of the parents involved in the present evaluation fell into this category. Questions were not asked concerning the child's specific handicap during the previous year's program so no direct comparison can be made. However, the average age of the handicapped child whose parents were participating in this year's program was almost two years younger than that of the previous year's. Eighty-five percent (85%) of the parents who responded that they had difficulty relating their experiences to the transparencies were

parents of pre-school children and children whose handicap was classified as "other". For this reason it is suggested that the transparencies or program be somewhat modified to give special consideration to these situations.

Items included in this year's Parent Opinionnaire indicated that not all parents were being adequately exposed to the Resource Directory but that those who were exposed found the contained information valuable.

The trainers, in general, seemed satisfied with the training sessions, program materials and parental progress. Their responses to the Trainer Opinionnaire indicated that higher availability of reference materials would increase their satisfaction with the program and their ability to conduct the parent meetings.

In conclusion it should be said that the data indicates no serious weaknesses of the program. Both parents and trainers felt very positive about the experience. The major program goals of encouraging parents to express their feelings, to act as resources to each other and to have the opportunity to gain cognitive information concerning their child's handicap were certainly accomplished in a most satisfactory manner.

References

Bourque, M., Study of the physical and human environment. Final Report. Submitted to the Center for the Study of Human Potential, School Of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1974.

Campbell, D. T., and Stanley, J. C., Experimental and quasi experimental design for research. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966.

Cook, L. L., An evaluative study of the longitudinal effect of the CREC parent education program "Parenting and the Exceptional Child". Final Report submitted to Capitol Region Education Council, Bloomfield, Conn., 1975.

Cronbach, L. J., Test validation. In Thorndike, R.L. (Ed.), Educational Measurement, 2nd Ed., Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Miller, D. C., Handbook of research design and social measurement, 2nd Ed., New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1970.

Rossett, A., "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" year one final report. Submitted to Capitol Region Education Council, Bloomfield, Conn., 1975.

Stufflebeam, D. L., Foley, W. J., Gephart, W. J., Guba, E. G., Hammond, R. L., Merriman, H. O., Provus, M. M., Educational evaluation and decision making, Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971.

III. The Future of the Program

The termination of Title III funding for CREC's "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" program will not signal the end of the program's availability for use by educators. Great effort has gone into familiarizing local, regional and national distribution mechanisms with the program. The following efforts should assure that interested educators will be able to see, study and use the program:

(1) The National Center for Media and Materials for the Handicapped is reviewing the program for possible national distribution. If they decide to disseminate it, the program will be available at a very reasonable price to a national audience.

(2) The First Chance Early Childhood Network (USOE) has been given two copies for examination and distribution to interested educators.

(3) Closer Look, the special education information arm of the federal government, has requested and been sent Fact Sheets and two complete copies of the program.

(4) The ERIC Clearinghouse has requested information on the program. They have been sent several Fact Sheets relating to the program.

(5) Each Regional Educational Service Center (RESC) in Connecticut has at least five copies of the program and a letter offering suggestions for its distribution.

(6) The Resource Directory has been distributed to RESCs and to each public library in Connecticut. The Special Education Resource Center (SERC) will use a grant to update and continue distribution of this effort.

(7) Educators involved in ASPIRA have indicated interest in producing a Spanish translation of the program. This work would increase the number of parents and settings to which the program would be applicable.

(8) The Project Director, Training Associate and Executive Director of CREC have established a continuing policy for dissemination. (See Appendix F.)

(9) The Project Director will work with interested schools and agencies to make training sessions available to them. The Project Director plans to talk and write about the program in the future. An upcoming article in Early Years - Parent and a proposed presentation to the 1977 CEC convention in Atlanta should continue dissemination of information about the program.

In conclusion, and based upon the response of observers, trainers, and parents, it is felt that the program makes a substantial contribution to the tools which are available to professionals working with parents of exceptional children. The history, effects and future of the program described in this document substantiate this positive appraisal.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

A1 - Orientation Meeting - CREC - December 5, 1975

Haller: The first time I saw the word "Parenting," I snickered and thought, "Well, that's something that just sort of happens to you and you don't need many qualifications to be a parent except to be there.

It is becoming increasingly apparent (no pun intended) that to be a parent is something for which you sometimes wish you had a little training. And if your child is exceptional, then parenting is a double task."

Rossett: This is a program meant to be used by educators, trained persons, in working with parents of children with special needs . . .

It is a program of open-ended media visuals which depict parents and their children in interactions located in and around the home or in the community. The interactions are unresolved.

How it Was Made Up:

Teachers and administrators were saying "If we're able to get parents into the school or into a parents meeting, too much time is wasted."

Parents really needed materials which would cue in some of the home problem interactions and give parents something to identify with, and enable time to be spent not so much on group building and on catharsis, but on (1) speaking about how you were feeling, and (2) making specific suggestions for changes in what parents were actually doing in their homes.

This program then is a "systematic approach for using the time well when parents get together with educators." It is a systematic attempt to provide cues, visual cues, for educators to use with parents to get them to talk about what goes on in the home, what it is that they need or wish to change about what goes on in their home, and the immediate proximity to their home.

I used a "Needs Assessor," a series of questions to parents about what goes on in their homes, to which the answers would give me some specific ideas (so that I was not just guessing) about the problem areas and the joy areas. I asked them to be very specific -- and that's where the visual cues for this program came from. --- Most of the visuals will be read as

focusing on the problem areas, because this is a program which is for remediation, for change, and to fill in deficit areas. But it's not only that! It's also meant as an opportunity for parents to talk about some good things too.

The total program came out of interaction with those whom the program was designed to serve, educators and parents.

Program Can be Used in Three Ways:

1. Least good use is in a large group as a way to tease, interest and motivate parents to come back for more. (First school meeting of the year.)
   Select 5 or 6 visuals and point out the various themes. Ask the parents, "Do these touch on some needs you have?"

2. Optimum way to use the program when a trained person and a group of between 6 and 15 parents use 6 to 8 visuals per session for small group interaction.

3. A caseworker/teacher having individual conferences with parents can show one or two visuals which can get the parent talking with a little bit of distance about a specific interaction in his/her home.

Discussing Goals of the Program:

1. There is much focus put on the needs of exceptional children in schools but not much done on what goes on in their homes. This needs to be made more popular.

2. Catharsis and ventilation are not enough of a reason to form parent groups. Educators need to realize the importance of designing specific things for parents to do with their children. Parents need to talk about their feelings and then Do something with those feelings.

3. In the federally-funded project we were encouraged not to take strong stands either for behavior modification or against it and for total or oral communication or against it.
   This year, we do not have those restraints on us and now I suggest that behavior modification is a really effective way to go especially for these kinds of children.
   However, the program can be used just as effectively with the most Rogerian of approaches.
   The visuals are open-ended, situational pictures and if you, as a trainer, are most comfortable in the extremely non-directive mode, it can be used and it will provide extremely provocative discussions. I can't promise quantum leaps and changes in parent/child behaviors, but it will provide a good group building experience.

4. I found out that it really wasn't a problem to treat several categories of exceptionality after I used the "Needs Assessor" and after talking to enough parents and teachers. The same general themes were common among most children with special needs. Yes, there are special emphases -- and that is where the trainer has to use his/her own special expertise, but the themes remain the same and many of the visuals fit into several theme categories.

Questions:

1. *Could a parent be the leader?*
   Yes, parents who have learned the techniques really can do it if they:
   a. have been a teacher, etc.,
   b. have an introspective, self-evaluative perception of him/her self as a parent,
   c. have had behavior modification training,
   d. feel comfortable with a fairly directive stance,
   e. could co-lead as Parent/Teacher or Parent/Psychologist.

2. *Is the group better if there is a common exceptionality?*
   Most groups will have one single exceptionality. Try other ways -- we just don't know yet.

3. *Is it possible to get a translation into Spanish?*
   We have a real need for this in our area. It could be done because the program is in the public domain as it was funded with a Title III grant.

4. *Is this program advantageous for groups already formed?*
   It has been used with either old or brand new groups. If used with already formed groups, I suggest the following:
   a. The subject material must not be redundant with what has gone on before.
   b. Use 2 or 3 visuals on new themes.

5. *Will this kind of program interfere with any counseling that is going on? Or therapy?*
   That is a real good question. This is an instructional program. It is not meant to be counseling or therapy or to help parents get in touch with themselves or any of those things which are terribly important but which this program is not intended to be.
   This program gets people going. It is meant to help the trainer focus in on what the parents can do in their own homes -- it's a structured action program.
   A wise trainer will refer out when there are special needs by parents.

6. *Are 2 or 3 sessions of training enough? It seems there's so much "in depth" kind of thing, just what do you do?*

Go visual by visual after going through the Needs Assessor.

Find out which visuals the trainer feels comfortable with, or which ones you sense are ones you can't handle and how to refer out for these.

7. *Is it imperative that it be both parents? What about the single parent?*

If we waited for Mother-Father groups in the state of Connecticut, we would have one group with six couples!

Never wait -- take the mothers. It is unfortunate, but this is what happens!

Do you know that 25% of the households are homes with a single parent?

8. *I work with a group of older youngsters. Most of the visuals you have show younger children. Are there other visuals to use?*

If the visuals in the program are not appropriate -- use that which is closest and then get the parents to describe <u>their</u> situations. It won't matter because what you want is to use the visual to focus on the theme -- the open-endedness of the program is to help parents get at those specific situations that they want help with.

9. *Can you do the program without the training?*

Some people can, I'm sure. But, the training is available this year, and I suggest you take it. The program was designed to stand alone -- it may be used in North Dakota some day.

10. *How do you get more parents involved?*

Use the list of suggestions on page 19 of the manual.

A2 - Training Session I - Composite of CREC and ACES

CAVEATS

1. This program is not a panacea or a cure-all.

2. There are 3 components in the program:

    a. the Trainer's Manual of 100 pages,
    b. the 45 visuals depicting parents/children in unresolved interactions,
    c. the Resource Directory.

    They are important not for themselves, but rather for what a trainer does with them.

    It is a systematic way for stimulating parent to parent; parent to educator/counselor/social worker interaction. It will systematically evoke questions, concerns and issues and you, as the trainer, must:

    a. provide information,
    b. provide suggestions for an educational program between an individual parent and child,
    c. bring in outside resources,
    d. use the Resource Directory,
    e. say "I don't know -- let me try to find out."

3. This program will not make you a therapist, a social worker or a psychologist and it's not intended to do so!

4. Don't ever assume anything about the group with which you work.

    Each trainer must find out what the needs are. Use the Needs Assessor.

5. It is important that you read the following before you start:

    a. Parents Are Teachers, W. Becker.
    b. Living With Children, Patterson and Gullion (both from Research Press).
    c. Bill Heward's section on behavior modification in the Manual.

6. The program will not be effective if you "wing-it." Before you work with the parents:

    a. read the entire manual,
    b. look through all the visuals,
    c. read the Resource Directory and highlight the things most useful to your parents.

7. Read through the section on The Trainer in the manual, pp. 6-8. Do you fit?

    a. Are you the right person to deal with certain areas?
    b. Will you know where to get others who have the training expertise and are respected by the group to help give information in specific areas?
    c. Will you know how to articulate the issues?
    d. Will you have enough resources: lists, phone numbers?

8. Be sure you understand the goal of the program.

    a. We're not trying to fix the insides of the parent.
    b. We're trying to help them be more effective parents.
    c. We're trying to give them more information.
    d. We're trying to give them support from other parents when they have specific problems/concerns.
    e. We're trying to learn about the exceptionality and share the facts.

9. Know, in your own mind, what you can and cannot do. Don't do it if:

    a. you see it as a chore.
    b. the Principal says "It's your turn to lead a parent group."
    c. you feel "Why is it always me?"
    d. you already have too much to do and can't spend time to prepare for each session.

    Do it if:

    a. you really want to put in time to prepare each session.
    b. you want to help with the changes in a child's learning and behavior and you want to solidify those changes by your relationship to the parents who will be involved in making those changes.
    c. you have a certain amount of expertise in parent education, and are familiar with the needs of children with special needs and you know how to assess the specific needs of those children.
    d. you are willing to design a "Needs Assessor" for your particular parents using the general theme areas of the visuals.
    e. you will take the time to decide which are the areas of greatest concern and of concern to your parents, and select visuals to use at a series of meetings to deal with those special areas.
    f. you will decide on the goals and objectives in order to get beyond the parents concerns at each session.

10. You must narrow what you are trying to do. Look at the list of goals and decide which are important. Pick only a few!

    If you accomplish only one goal -- you will have greatly served the parents.

11. In order to find specialists to bring in:

    a. Use the Resource Directory to find agencies/organizations who have specialists who serve as representatives in your area. That's their job and that's a part of the public relations/information/education use.

    b. Use people where you work; most of you are in a service situation where you have resource teachers, counselors, guidance or vocational counselors. Start with the Administrator, the Principal or the Director and get their suggestions.

    c. Be careful not to overuse certain people. You don't need an expert for every session.

12. How to increase parent involvement. Reasons for not coming:

    a. Parents remember how they felt -- school was an adversive environment.
    b. When parents have a special child and have to come to school, all they hear are complaints and criticisms and problems with the child.

    Use the "Handy Dandy Ways to Involve Parents" listed in the Manual -- some of the suggestions might work!

13. This program cannot provide parent-to-parent counseling, but the group can do things educationally in programming positive behavior in parent/child and parent/parent interaction.

14. If you don't know how to deal with a parent on "How to do it" (toilet training, discipline, etc.) you should probably:

    a. take a course in behavior modification,
    b. team-teach the course with someone who does know.

<u>In Using the Transparencies</u>:

1. These are a series of visual prompts to get responses from parents, the heart of the program.

2. Not all visuals or all themes will be of interest to all parents.

    The trainer is the one who will know which ones apply. Because the visuals are probing, the trainer must know the group and how it will respond.

3. Use visuals sparingly -- each has infinite possibilities and will evoke parent responses. Maximum, 7 or 8 per session.

4. The visuals are designed to hone in and focus on a challenging subject. The trainer must keep parents from talking about the visual and move them on to talk about the subject, not its representation.

5. The trainer's major responsibility is to serve the parents first. The visuals are a means of reaching the objective that the trainer (YOU) set.

6. The important thing is the interaction that follows the use of the visuals. They are important, not for themselves, but how they are used by the trainer to evoke interactions between parent/parent and parent/trainer.

7. Many parents will look at the visuals and see what they want to see. They should be asking:

    a. What's going on here?
    b. Was this a good thing to do?
    c. Why did she/he do this?
    d. What other procedures might be involved?
    e. When is it legitimate to do this?
    f. What else might this depict?
    g. Are the parents doing what is appropriate?

8. Some visuals are group builders: parents sharing similar experiences to solidify the group. Parents will read into the visuals only what they have experienced or their immediate concerns.

    a. Can they share their solutions to problems?
    b. Do they recognize appropriate parental behaviors/attitudes?
    c. What are the standards for specific problems, such as bath-tubbing, dinner table, toilet training?
    d. Can parents role-play appropriate behaviors?

    It has often happened that in a group of 8 parents there will be only 2 who agree on standards and behavior, and they won't be from the same family!

9. Some visuals lead to group building behaviors to learn how to educate the public about the various exceptionalities. You must deal with accurate informational answers to questions from different ages of inquirers.

10. Some visuals lend themselves to <u>lots</u> of take-home lists and materials. Include one of these each session.

11. Be sure you select visuals/treatments which jibe with:

    a. what they are interested in.
    b. what can be done to change the behavior.

12. Each visual has both cognitive and affective components. Use the affective component to get the parents to respond. Then use the cognitive component to provide the information and the action -- what to do about it.

13. a. Don't use a visual until you have appropriate information to give to the parents; preferably a take-home list.

    b. Be sure you give parents sources of information:

        1. what services are available
        2. from whom and when
        3. for what ages
        4. what is the cost.

14. Be sure you are prepared to deal with the issue:

    a. Be aware of the routes/courses which the conversation with parents will take.
    b. Be sure you have plenty of suggestions/information to use to help parents.

15. Use generalizations in the transparencies as analogs -- help parents identify with problems rather than saying, "Whew, I'm glad that's not me."

A List of Some of The Best Ways to use Visuals:

1. Follow up a group session using the visual with individual sessions where you will be providing programming for specific behavior changes.

2. Bring in adults with the exceptionality who are leading satisfactory lives or at least bring in case studies of such people.

3. Bring in experts in reading, placement, sexuality, whatever the issue is that concerns parents.

4. Set up task groups of parents to find resources, or as resources for each other.

5. Have parents serve as lobbyists -- that's how you're going to get the changes in services. Once they get together, that group will solidify.

6. Never just talk/ventilate -- plan actions and reinforced actions.

7. Be directive -- obviously be supportive -- in terms of "Yes, that is a problem, but what can you do about it?" And find out the answers, if there are answers.
   Also, it is important to say "That's a problem, I'll

look for the answer." Or, "That's a problem and I don't think there is an answer." Always be honest!! "I don't know, or I'll find out."

8. Keep good group interaction -- as a trainer -- Don't be the ratifier at all times. Let parents help zero in on the problems. Silence is okay if it is a time when people are thinking -- be sure you know the difference between thinking and avoidance.

9. Give parents something to take home each time:

    a. A list - a useful list.
    b. Appointment with a professional.
    c. A pat on the back.
    d. An assignment to bring back next meeting and then be sure to ask for and talk about it at the next meeting. If both parents attend, get separate lists. They will often vary -- "examine this -- think about this" -- and use it!

10. Always know what you're going to be doing and really prepare for it -- plan the interactions. Don't "wing it."
    Stay away from the problems which don't have answers and stick to those for which you have answers/resources.

11. Don't be afraid to say, "Let's hold on that topic" -- or "I think it's beyond our goals for this evening."

12. If you have 8 parents in a room and 2 are doing all the talking, you might try the Poker Chip Routine: which is 3, 4 or 5 chips are given to each parent when they come in. Then, when they offer something, they relinquish a poker chip. Half-way through the session you may see someone trying to borrow a poker chip from someone else in order to talk or they will have to remain quiet.
    Give parents a chance to volunteer their ideas. You will have quiet parents -- don't change that, but be sure you have not created an environment in which they are afraid to say something. You will have to ascertain this -- by asking!

13. Think: When and if I implement this program, I want to focus on:

    a. Action, not talk.
    b. Issues that I can do something about.
    c. Their needs which match with my expertise.
    d. Their frustrations and how to minimize them -- how to deal with them.
    e. The acceptance of differences.
    f. Sharing experiences among parents -- group building.
    g. Helping parents talk about their educational program for their children:

1. their dreams of what their kids will be like.
2. how the program can help them get there.

h. The nature of the exceptionality:

1. What is it that your child now can do?
2. What are the hopes of what your child can do?
3. What are the resources for helping your child to reach that place?

i. Remember the joys of interaction of child/parent -- Share the humor.

A3 - Training Session II - Composite of CREC and ACES

It is very important to prepare for each session individually.

I. List of Strategies for Preparation of Sessions

1. Never "wing-it."
2. Use the "Needs Assessor" and select out those areas that are important to your parents.
3. Select the theme areas in order of importance.
4. Use the Manual to select the visuals.
    a. Check the top line of page for theme areas.
    b. Select the visuals that mesh with your areas of expertise.
    c. Select those visuals providing the most interest to your parents.
    d. Select visuals similar in needs to the exceptionalities of your parents.
    e. Read the pages of treatment of each visual you select.
5. Anticipate the questions, needs and concerns that the visuals are likely to evoke.
6. If you don't have enough information at the meeting, tell parents you'll find the information if available and give it to them at the next meeting.
7. Know what goes on in the meeting and don't be afraid to put the lid on by saying, "I don't think that those are things we can get into. Let me see if you can speak with so & so about that." Don't deal with intensely personal, raw nerve problems in the large group, if at all.
8. Anticipate the questions, needs, resources and then prepare, based on selected visuals.
9. Know how to design Behavior Modification Programs which address the special areas.
10. Know local, state and national resources that will be of interest and address the concerns evoked by the visuals.

11. Bring somebody with you with special expertise.

    a. Get an expert to work with your group.
    b. Don't make them a lecturer: when inviting them, suggest they talk for 20 minutes and include open questions and answers; thank them for coming and then continue with the kinds of interactions that have been going on all around them.
    c. If it's a subject of particular interest, schedule an extra session -- invite all parents -- not just for your group but use your parents to do the introduction.
    d. Don't break up the good flow of a group by bringing in an expert who bestows the information and destroys the building of your group.
    e. Try to keep the experts used in the mode your program has gone.
    f. Where do you find the experts?
        1. use the Resource Directory.
        2. pay? -- or as part of their job.
    g. Be sure to prepare experts ahead of time by giving them the nature of the group and the issues that have been raised in previous weeks.

12. Be prepared for all "spin-offs," and be ready to cope with them.

    Be sure to keep a list of what questions you are going to look up and prepare for the next meeting.

13. Prepare something for parents to take with them. Such as:

    a. A print-out of a section of the Resource Directory.
    b. Selected names of doctors, dentists, etc.
    c. Special recreation, camps, etc.
    d. Be sure you up-date and give ages for each list.

II. In Using the Program

1. If you don't know the answer, say so -- but do follow up and try to get answers!

2. When parents get very emotional

    a. Let them know that you recognize their concern.
    b. You are not a psychiatrist.
    c. Can you deal with this by asking them to share their feelings with the group?
    Hard to talk about this - give the option of talking/sharing.
    Have some information/action ideas to share or give suggestions for/at next meeting.

d. Deal with this on individual basis -- get up and go over and touch the person.
e. Sharing the information of other parents can help by not always being the "ratifier."
f. Focus on action strategies you can help with.

3. Don't search for a consensus of ideas:

a. Always share methods as resources.
b. Trainer must be able to suggest "if it works -- it's O.K."
c. Don't let parents feel threatened -- suggest strategies and make them eager to come back to talk about their successes.

4. When a wife says, "This time, you go" to her husband,

a. As a trainer you can't embrace all methods of upbringing as equally good, even if the husband prefers one particular method.
b. Trainer can disagree with a parent -- better yet, let the other parents give their opinions -- pro or con the specific method of upbringing.
c. Use this person (the husband) as a baseline to see if you can help change his attitudes over a series of meetings.
d. If there are husband/wife relationship problems, reinforce his being there (when group is mostly wives). Get him to talk about mothering and fathering <u>equalling</u> parenting.

5. If parents talk in the group in such a way as to demonstrate a lack of information or education about the subject -- it may be important to see that they get the information needed by themselves <u>after</u> the group meeting. Working with the social worker, counselor or other aids is also important.
Assess the parent after 3 or 4 sessions and provide needed referrals or resources.

6. A parent group should have 15 parents at the first session (the number will drop). Minimum is probably 6 -- Aim for an average of 10 parents.

7. As a trainer, remember:

a. To focus on providing information.
b. To provide an opportunity for verbal behavior rehearsals -- "If I were -- this is how I would handle it."
c. To use specific suggestions for home behaviors.
d. To know what are all the directions that the parent concerns could go?
e. To focus on the positive.
f. To get specific suggestions when dealing with problems and give supportive resource information.

g. To use humor!
h. If issues come up that can't be included -- and are important -- be sure to mention and bring up next week.
i. To understand parents' frustrations and give alternate behaviors and suggestions for other options.
j. Don't try to deal with too much in one visual. Sort out what goes well with each of several visuals on same subject.

8. If you get a "Way Out" parent or the long-talker:

a. You can cut them off.
b. Try drawing in others.
c. Ignore his hands.
d. Suggest shortening the speeches.
e. Help modify his behavior.
f. Use hand-raising only if necessary and if in a large group.

9. In choosing parents to invite to the group meetings,

a. Choose the parents based on the needs of the children of the same age, approximately the same problems.
b. Might need co-trainers with different disciplines -- principal/social worker, teacher/psychologist.
c. Keep ages/abilities similar for easier handling.

10. Allow two hours -- may start 20/25 minutes late -- you'll get a good hour and 1/2 anyway. And make the meetings once a week.

11. Serve refreshments? It helps -- if you're in the lounge, etc. Give parents a chance to participate.

12. Do parents take the responsibility for the time and place of the meetings? If you really want it done, you will set it up -- and then maybe you can get a volunteer parent who you know is responsible.
Keep it stable; e.g., every Thursday night from 7 to 9.

13. Notify parents in several ways about meetings. Hope that you will have four to six sessions minimum. It will vary -- depending on the needs of the group. They may want to go on.

14. We feel that if you are going to lead a parent group, you should have attended both training sessions. If you only attended one, perhaps you can co-lead with someone else. There is no way for me to evaluate whether you're competent to be a trainer or not -- but please speak with the administrator of your program and talk about your leading a group -- so that it isn't something that you just do as a sidelight/You should be supported by your school or your administration and that you are really prepared to do.

APPENDIX B

Agencies/Organizations/School Systems in Connecticut Attending Orientation/Training Sessions in 1975-1976

Agencies/Organizations

American School for the Deaf	- West Hartford
Area Special Education Association	- Colchester
Bayberry Kindergarten	- Westport
Connecticut State Department of Mental Retardation:	
Central Connecticut Regional Center	- Meriden
North Central Regional Center	- Bloomfield
Enfield Association for Retarded and Handicapped Citizens, Inc.	- Enfield
Elizabeth Ives School	- Hamden
Family Resource Group	- Middletown
FAVARH (Farmington Valley Association for Retarded and Handicapped, Inc.)	- Avon
Foster School	- New Haven
Gengras Center for Exceptional Children	- West Hartford
(The) Greater Hartford Association for Retarded Citizens	- Hartford
League for Autistic and Mentally Handicapped Children	- East Hartford
Mental Health Association of Connecticut	- Middletown
New Haven Rehabilitation Center	- New Haven
New Horizons School (Meriden - Wallingford Society for Retarded Children, Inc.)	- Meriden
Newington Children's Hospital	- Newington
Society to Advance the Retarded (STAR)	- Norwalk

Special Education Resource Center	-	Hartford
State Advisory Council on Special Education	-	Hartford
Turtle, Inc.	-	Middletown
United Cerebral Palsy of Greater Hartford	-	Hartford
United Cerebral Palsy Association	-	New Haven
Waterbury Association for Retarded Citizens	-	Waterbury
Wheeler School	-	Plainville

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Also Attended:

Little People's School	-	West Newton, Massachusetts

School Systems

Ansonia	Harwinton	Portland
Avon	Hebron	Simsbury
Bloomfield	Madison	South Windsor
Burlington	Manchester	Tolland
East Granby	Middletown	West Hartford
East Hampton	New Haven	Westport
East Haven	North Haven	Wilton
Fairfield	Old Saybrook	Windsor
Hartford	Plainville	Woodbridge

APPENDIX C

Out-of-State Organizations/Agencies/Schools Contacting the Project

William J. Irwin, Staff Inspector
Guidance and Special Education
Block "A" Q.I.T. Buildings

Brisbane, Q 4000
Australia

Donald Dawson, School Psychologist
Lethbridge School District No. 51
433 - 15th South

Lethbridge, Alberta
Canada

Rose Engel Principal
Los Angeles City - Unified School District
Sophia T. Salvin Elementary School
1925 Bud Long Avenue

Los Angeles
California 90007

Barbara J. Dolmovic, District Psychologist
Palmdale School District
P. O. Box 218

Palmdale
California 93550

Michael E. Schneider, Funded Programs Director
East Otero Public Schools R-2
P. O. Box 311

Rocky Ford
Colorado 81067

Lucille M. Pressnell, Ph.D., Director
The Davison School
1500 North Decatur Road N.E.

Atlanta
Georgia 30306

Carol Catoe, Infant Evaluator
Comprehensive Psycho Educational Services
Regional Office
P. O. Box 1508

Valdosta
Georgia 31601

Carol Sebian, Community Worker
Granite City Pre-School
Madison County Association for Retarded Citizens
1623A Washington Square Plaza
Room 208

Alton
Illinois 62002

Alvinette M. Burks, Social Worker
Harvey Pre-School for Exceptional Children
45 East 150th Street

Harvey
Illinois 60426

Eva Ellman, Resource Teacher
4638 West Grove Street

Skokie
Illinois 62076

Joan D. Anderson, Teacher
Mental Retardation Pre-School
Forest Creek Apt. 3B

Ruston
Louisiana 71270

Melissa Carlisle, Secretary
National Learning Disabilities
Assistance Project
The Network

Merrimac
Massachusetts 01860

Daniel Foley, School Psychologist
Little People's School

West Newton
Massachusetts 02165

Elizabeth Kitchell, Director
Special Education Department
Mecosta-Osceola Intermediate School District
205 Maple Street

Big Rapids
Michigan 49307

James Wragg, Coordinator
Speech and Hearing Programs
St. Joseph County
Intermediate School District
Shimmel Road

Centreville
Michigan 49032

Crystal Ordway, Resource Teacher
Jackson County Intermediate School District
Commercial Exchange Building
2301 East Michigan Avenue
Jackson
Michigan 49202

Ilze Hammersley, Teacher/Counselor
for the Physically Handicapped
Monroe County Intermediate School District
1101 South Raisinville Road
Monroe
Michigan 48161

Thomas S. Sawyer, Assistant Director-Special Education
Suburban Hennepin County Area
Vocational Technical Schools
1820 North Xenium Lane
Minneapolis
Minnesota 55441

S. A. Shannon, Assistant Superintendent-Administration
Mehlville School District
3120 Lemay Ferry Road
St. Louis
Missouri 63125

Jackie McKinsey
Missouri Association for Children with
Learning Disabilities
P. O. Box 3303 - Glenstone Station
Springfield
Missouri 65804

Robert Geibert, Coordinator of Education
Martin Luther Home
804 South 12th Street
P. O. Box 607
Beatrice
Nebraska 68310

Lenore K. Fox, Title I Teacher/Coordinator
Main Street School
Englishtown
New Jersey 07726

Kolman M. Kleinbord, Ph.D., Director
Pupil Personnel Services
Haddonfield Public Schools
Haddonfield
New Jersey 08033

Kathy Maulden, President
New Mexico Alliance Concerned with School Age Parents
New Mexico Education Services Consortium
Highway 85 North, P.O. Box 640
Bernalillo
New Mexico 87004

Sister Claude Maria
St. Francis de Sales
School for the Deaf
260 Eastern Parkway
Brooklyn
New York 11225

Judith Goldsmith Nackman, Psychology Consultant
Bernard Fineson Developmental Center
Howard Park Unit
155-55 Cross Bay Boulevard
Howard Beach
New York 11414

Kat Parker, Regional Program Planner
Educational District I
Regional Support and Technical Assistance Center
P. O. Box 928
Grifton
North Carolina 28530

Peg Dubord, Child Development Specialist
Southeast Mental Health and Retardation Center
P. O. Box 2083
Fargo
North Dakota 58102

Julie King, ALRC Consultant
Instructional Resource Center
221 West Ninth Avenue
Columbus
Ohio 43201

Art Fabian, ALRC Consultant
Miami Valley Regional Center for Handicapped Children
1150 Beatrice Drive
Dayton
Ohio 45404

Donna McNichols, Teacher
Primary Special Education
P. O. Box 108 Rt. #1
Laurelville
Ohio 43135

Marion R. Murphy, MSW
Chester County Association for Retarded Citizens, Inc.
20 North High Street
West Chester
Pennsylvania 19380

Judy S. Myers, Social Services
Cerebral Palsy Treatment Center of Harris County, Inc.
1415 California

Houston
Texas 77006

Nadine Canales, ECE-H Home Liaison
Edgewood Independent School District
5358 West Commerce Street

San Antonio
Texas 78237

Reed Bates, Ph.D., Technical Writer
Jackie Miller, Researcher
Texas Regional Resource Center
211 East Seventh Street

Austin
Texas 78701

Sharon Yeargley
Division of Rehabilitation
Utah State Board of Education
1400 University Club Building
136 East South Temple Street

Salt Lake City
Utah 84111

Barbara S. Hansen, Teacher
Virginia Beach Tomorrow
City Hall Municipal Center

Virginia Beach
Virginia 23456

APPENDIX D

Out-of-State University and Student Requests for the Program

Universities

Julie Ballard
Kuskokwim Community College
P. O. Box 368

Bethel
Alaska 99559

Jean Oracheff, M.A., Lecturer
Department of Special Education
Arizona State University
College of Education

Temple
Arizona 85281

M. Patricia Simmons, Ph.D., Co-Director
Model Infant - Family Project
California State University - Los Angeles
5151 State University Drive

Los Angeles
California 90032

Donna Lehr
Early On Longfellow School
5055 July Street

San Diego
California 92110

Marilyn Volker, M.Ed., Coordinator
Language Development Program for Hearing Impaired Infants
Mailman Center for Child Development
University of Miami

Miami
Florida 33152

Jeannette Frink, Assistant Professor
Special Education Department
Fort Hays - Kansas State College

Hays
Kansas 67601

Susan M. Kershman, Coordinator
Program for Early Childhood Education for the Handicapped
College of Education
Department of Special Education
University of Kentucky

Lexington
Kentucky 40506

Robert D. Jackson, Assistant Professor and Director
Special Education Program
Room 109, School of Education
University of Massachusetts

Amherst
Massachusetts 01002

Special Education Instructional Materials Center
University of the State of New York
State Education Department
55 Elk Street

Albany
New York 12234

Lillian P. Shapiro, Ed.D., Adjunct Assistant Professor
Coordinator, Early Childhood Special Education
Teachers College
Columbia University
Department of Special Education

New York
New York 10027

William Heward
Department of Special Education
The Ohio State University

Columbus
Ohio 43210

Carol McIntosh
Associate Director for Library Services
Texas State Learning Resource Center
Education Building, Room 348
1912 Speedway

Austin
Texas 78712

Students from Out of State Universities

Kathryn Misczynski
5628 Bridle Glen

Agoura
California 91301

Kathleen Scott
235 Union Avenue #B2026

San Jose State University

Campbell
California 95008

Linda McAninch
103 Dearborn Place, Apt. 22

Goleta
California 93017

Mary Lee Milburn 1419 Seventeenth Street Greeley Colorado 80631	
Elizabeth True Browder 177 Aspinwall Avenue Brookline Massachusetts 02146	Graduate Program in Home Economics Education (Family Living) Simmons College
Susan Reed 3 Auldwood Lane Rumson New Jersey 07760	Special Education Smith College
Elizabeth Anne Morrow School of Education Syracuse University 805 South Crouse Avenue Syracuse New York 13210	Graduate Student Audiology and Speech Pathology
Carol Houston 490 Canyon Road Logan Utah 84321	Utah State University class entitled "Counseling Parents of Exceptional Children"
Maggie Damiano 4787 North Newhall Street Whitefish Bay Wisconsin 53211	Graduate Student Marquette University

APPENDIX E

State of Connecticut Requests for Information: Full Program and/or Directories

I - Agencies/Organizations/Schools

Betty Austin, Children's Librarian
Madison Public Library
801 Boston Post Road
Madison

Robert Benoit, Audiologist
Newington Children's Hospital
Speech and Hearing Clinic
181 East Cedar Street
Newington

Nancy N. DeSalvo, Coordinator
Services for Children & Young Adults
The Village Library
71 Main Street
Farmington

Will DuKeyne, Director
Darien Public Library
Leroy Avenue
Darien

Shirley Halligen, Children's Librarian
The Fairfield Public Library
1080 Old Post Road
Fairfield

Mary C. Main, Regional Director
Mental Health Association of
Connecticut, Inc.
Central Connecticut Chapter
deKoven House
27 Washington Street
Middletown

Naugatuck Valley Society for
Autistic Children, Inc.
P.O. Box 166
Waterbury

Nina Pierce, MSW Parent Education
Program
Nancy Zimmer, Director of Community
Relations
Elmcrest Psychiatric Institute
25 Marlborough Street
Portland

Susan Rayner, Junior Services
Westport Public Library
19 East State Street
Westport

State of Connecticut
Board of Education and
Services for the Blind
State Resource Library
170 Ridge Road
Wethersfield

State of Connecticut
Department of Mental Retardation
Bridgeport Regional Center
370 Crescent Avenue
Bridgeport

State of Connecticut
Department of Mental Retardation
Danbury Regional Center
400 Main Street
Danbury

State of Connecticut
Department of Mental Retardation
North Central Regional Center
73 Rockwell Avenue
Bloomfield

Betty Stephens, Commissioner
Commission on Human Relations
330 Laurel Street
Apartment 305-6
Hartford

Jane Strom, Director of
Client Services
United Cerebral Palsy Association
of Connecticut, Inc.
One State Street
New Haven

Robert Tausz, CRC Program Director
Kennedy Center Workshop
964 Crescent Avenue
Bridgeport

United Cerebral Palsy Association
of Greater Hartford
50 South Main Street
West Hartford

II - Teachers in Connecticut

Ann Black, Chairman Pupil Services
Fairfield Public Schools
214 Main Street
Southport

Edward A. Buck
South School
South Street
Windsor Locks

Nancy L. Burge
176 Parker Road
Somers

Patricia A. Chaco
Humiston School
30 Spring Street
Cheshire

Barbara Damanskas
Special Education Teacher
Bowers School
141 Princeton Street
Manchester

Stanley M. Isler, Director
Pupil Personnel & Special Services
North Haven Public Schools
1151 Hartford Turnpike
North Haven

George A. Lagios, Director
Special Educational Services
Bristol Public Schools
Board of Education Annex
91 Academy Street
Forestville

Catherine Lambert
115 Virginia Avenue
Bridgeport

Elizabeth C. Nelson
Lebanon Avenue
Colchester

Al Sancho, Principal
Warehouse Point School
School Street
Warehouse Point

Ann Seigel, Resource Teacher
Wintonbury School
1133 Blue Hills Avenue
Bloomfield

Corrine Winard
Batchelder School

New Britain

III - In State Colleges

Les Horvath, Assistant Professor
of Special Education
Central Connecticut State College
Department of Education
1615 Stanley Street

New Britain

Dr. John Cassell
Department of Special Education
St. Joseph · College
1678 Asylum Avenue

West Hartford

Dr. Terry Lawrence
Department of Special Education
Southern Connecticut State College
501 Crescent Street

New Haven

IV - Parents in Connecticut

Carl Jicha
42 Parker Terrace

Glastonbury

JoAnn Spear
Child-Find Committee of Connecticut
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 2219

Hartford

Claire Trengrove
275 South Street

Vernon

Mrs. Lawrence Olson
P.O. Box O

Middle Haddam

APPENDIX F

Capitol Region Education Council
800 Cottage Grove Road, Bldg 2
Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002
Area Code 203 243-8923

June 28, 1976

MEMORANDUM

FROM: Allison Rossett

RE: Dissemination Procedures for "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" Program (Manual, set of 45 Transparencies, and Resource Directory) Revised from March 11 and 29, 1976.

REQUEST: "Even though I couldn't attend the training sessions, I'd still like to use the program with a group of parents in my school. I have no special, advanced training, but I'll read the manual very carefully."

CREC RESPONSE:
CREC is providing the program at no cost only to persons who participated in training, implementation and evaluation of the program.
Persons not involved in these procedures who request a copy should request a copy from their RESC or the National Center for Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped (NCEMMH) * after June 30, 1976 (See end for address).

REQUEST: "I heard about the program from a teacher in another school, and I'd like to look it over."

CREC RESPONSE:
Certainly. Teachers, counselors, social workers and parents may borrow for preview purposes only.
Requests to own and then use with parents should be directed to their RESC (If a Connecticut group) or directed to NCEMMH, if they decide to distribute the program.
CREC will provide preview copies only through June 30, 1976. Then, all requests relating to preview should go to the appropriate RESC or to the Special Education Resource Center, 275 Windsor Street, Hartford, CT. 06120

POLICY FOR PREVIEW

1. Anyone in Connecticut may receive a Preview Set of the Program (3 parts) as long as they promise that they will not use it with parent groups and will return the entire program within thirty days (30 days.)

2. The Preview copies may be obtained from the RESCs, SERC or from NCEMMH (which is currently in the process of considering the program for distribution).

REQUEST: "I have a Master's Degree in Social Work and another Master's in Special Education. I am completing my doctorate in Special Education now. I'd like to team with a teacher and use the program beginning March 25, 1976."

CREC RESPONSE:
Direct the person you think is extremely well qualified to me. I will arrange for some kind of special training for such a unique situation---if they will participate in our evaluation scheme.

REQUEST: "I've been a participant in training, implementation and evaluation. We love the program and want to keep it to use next year."

CREC RESPONSE:
These persons may retain possession of the program ad infinitum at no cost to their schools or themselves, even if no group is formed. Hopefully, they will use the program eventually, and who is in a better position than they are to use it?

REQUEST: "I heard that CREC has 50 copies of the program in in a closet. Here we are with a need for it, why can't we have one?"

CREC RESPONSE:
Copies of the program have been distributed in the following way:

DISTRIBUTION OF 100 COPIES OF THE TOTAL PROGRAM

Trainers & Project Director	34
Charles Haller for In-Service Training & METRO (CREC)	5
Virginia O'Brien, Director, Special Ed (CREC)	5
RESCs - 5 copies to each center (6)	30
SERC - Copies for use by public in previewing	10
CREC - Copies for future distribution & national dissemination	16
TOTAL	100

Records of the placement of these programs will be maintained in the CREC office so that persons in Connecticut who request information and copies can be appropriately directed.

REQUEST: "I am more interested in the Resource Directory. I hear you have lots of copies of that."

CREC RESPONSE:
An additional printing of 125 copies of the Directory was made and distributed in the following way:

DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCE DIRECTORIES - WITHOUT PROGRAM

CREC Member Districts - Superintendents of Schools	35
CREC - Special Education Programs/Pupil Personnel Services	40
RESCs - 5 copies to each of 6 centers	30
Requests from schools and libraries, Regional Centers of Mental Retardation Depts, and other Agencies	20
TOTAL	125

It is with appreciation that the program thanks Ms. Faith Hektoen, Children's Specialist in the Connecticut State Library, Division of Library Development, for her generous offer of providing a copy of the Resource Directory (to be printed by the State Library) for each of the 169 public libraries in the state.

REQUEST: "I live in Danbury and I know the funding ran out several years ago. Where can I go to see and maybe use a copy of the program?

CREC RESPONSE:
Check with the appropriate RESC. If they can't help you try SERC. We also hope that NCEMMH, who is currently making an appraisal of the program and whether they wish to distribute it, will be able to help you.

REQUEST: "I live in Kentucky and want to see and maybe use the program, how do I find a copy?"

CREC RESPONSE:
SERC is the best place, although we hope that NCEMMH will distribute the program.

REQUEST: "The manual is very helpful but we'd like additional training. Where can we go?"

CREC RESPONSE:
CREC will keep track of my comings and goings. Schools and agencies can talk with me about arrangements for training after June 30, 1976.

**** NCEMMH is now reviewing the program for national distribution. I am hopeful that they will select to distribute. Their address is:

National Center for Educational Media
and Materials for the Handicapped
220 West Twelfth Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Attention: Dr. C. Rodney James

APPENDIX G Original Form

Parent Education Program Observer Rating Schedule

The purpose of the Parent Meeting Observer Rating Schedule is to provide a measure of the parent meeting environment as perceived by observers not directly involved with the CREC Parent Education Program. There are 20 items to be rated. In some instances, it may be necessary to solicit information from the trainer so that a judgment can be made. However, try to refrain from seeking trainer opinion unless necessary, since his/her perceptions will be measured by another instrument.

The observation period will be approximately 1½ hours. During that time you will rate each of the 20 items according to the following scale:

1. completely lacking	During the observation period this behavior did not occur, or this dimension was totally lacking.
2. inferior quality	The behavior occurred, or the dimension was present; but the quality was judged inferior as related to the intended purpose of the meeting.
3. acceptable quality	The behavior occurred, or the dimension was present; and the quality was judged acceptable as related to the intended purpose of the meeting.
4. good quality	The behavior occurred, or the dimension was present; and the quality was judged as good as related to the intended purpose of the meeting.
5. exceptional quality	The behavior occurred, or the dimension was present; and the quality was judged exceptional as related to the intended purpose of the meeting.
6. insufficient information	Sufficient information did not exist to allow the rater to make a judgment about this behavior or dimension.

In rating each item it is important to keep in mind that your judgment should be based as much as possible on observable behavior and evident facts.

Please place a "√" in the appropriate space beside each item. At the end of the check list you will find 5 free response items requiring short written answers.

Section I - Evaluation of the Trainer

Com. Lkg.	Quality				Insuf. Info.
	Infer.	Accep.	Good	Excep.	

1. The trainer stimulates discussion effectively. The trainer does not simply display the transparencies; he/she initiates the discussion by asking important questions, drawing attention to evocative details in the transparencies, etc.

2. The trainer appears comfortable in his/her role. He/She has a manner about him/her that makes the parents feel comfortable and relaxed.

3. The trainer displays the transparencies effectively. Does the trainer display the transparencies in such a manner that all the parents are able to see them easily and clearly.

4. The trainer paces the discussion effectively. Does the trainer continue with a topic when it is obvious that the parents have nothing more that is important to contribute. Does the trainer move on to new topics too quickly before the parents have had an opportunity to react thoroughly.

5. The trainer is flexible. Does the trainer enforce a rigid plan for the meeting or does he/she seem willing to abandon his/her original plan if an important discussion develops.

Com. Lkg.	Quality				Insuf. Info.
	Infer.	Accep.	Good	Excep.	

6. The trainer is able to supply adequate and understandable answers when a parent requests cognitive information. The trainer should be able either to supply satisfactory answers to parents when they ask specific questions about their child's handicap or to refer the parents to the proper resources for their answers.

7. The trainer encourages parent-parent interaction. Does the trainer suggest one parent's solution as the answer to another parent's problem, etc.

8. The trainer is actively involved in helping parents plan and implement behavior modification programs with their children. There is discussion during the meeting about the planning and implementing of behavior modification programs. The trainer is actively guiding the parents in the planning and implementation of these programs.

9. The trainer is using role rehearsal techniques with the parents at the meeting. The parents are participating in discussions in which they assume roles related to real-life situations with their own children.

10. The trainer encourages parents to express their personal feelings related to the problems they have as parents of exceptional children. The trainer asks questions such as "How did you feel about..." "What did you do...," etc.

Section II - Evaluation of the Transparencies

Com. Lkg.	Quality				Insuf. Info.
	Infer.	Accep.	Good	Excep.	

1. The transparencies stimulate parental response. Parents are anxious to discuss what the transparencies mean to them. The trainer does not seem to be having a difficult time encouraging parents to talk about the transparencies.

2. Parents could relate their own experiences to the transparencies. Parents readily recalled incidents in their own lives that the transparencies reminded them of.

3. Parental response to the transparencies is spontaneous. The parents do not require excessive prodding or questioning by the trainer in order to respond.

Section III - Evaluation of the Parents

1. The parents appear interested in the meeting. The parents are discussing issues related to the meeting with each other or with the trainer; the parents are nodding their heads in agreement. The parents are watching the trainer intently.

2. The parents seem comfortable and at ease with the meeting. Parents are relaxed and are participating in the discussion freely. They do not seem embarrassed or unusually reserved.

3. The parents express their personal feelings. The parents use sentences that begin "I feel..." They talk about their own experiences, ideas and problems.

Com. Lkg.	Quality				Insuf. Info.
	Infer.	Accep.	Good	Excep.	

4. The parents interact with each other. The parents make suggestions to each other based on their own experiences. The parents agree or disagree with each other about similar experiences. The parents offer sympathy or support to each other related to mutual problems.

5. The parents request cognitive information from the trainer. The parents are asking the trainer for specific information about their child's handicap or about problems they have with their child because of his/her handicap. The parents request information about local, state or national agencies that might be of assistance to them.

6. The parents are planning and implementing behavior modification programs with their children. The parents discuss plans for modifying the behavior of their children with the trainer and with each other. The parents discuss the results of behavior modification programs with the trainer and/or with each other.

7. Parents seemed comfortable with role rehearsal technique. The parents seemed at ease and un-embarrassed when called on to assume a role in a situation depicting a real-life experience. The parents seemed willing to participate in the previously described situation.

Section IV - Free Response Items

1. If you can recall any transparencies that fit the following descriptions, please list them.

   a. Very stimulating; most parents wanted to talk about experiences they had that were related to these transparencies.

   b. Boring; none of the parents had experiences they wanted to discuss that were related to these transparencies.

   c. Offensive; the transparencies angered, disgusted or embarrassed the parents.

2. What aspects of the meeting do you think were most productive?

3. What aspects of the meeting do you think were least productive?

4. What suggestions do you have for improving the meetings?

5. What comments do you have that might be of particular interest to the project director?

Revised Form

Parent Education Program Observer Rating Schedule

The purpose of the Parent Meeting Observer Rating Schedule is to provide a measure of the parent meeting environment as perceived by observers not directly involved with the CREC Parent Education Program. There are 14 items to be rated. In some instances it may be necessary to solicit information from the trainer so that a judgment can be made. However, try to refrain from seeking trainer opinion unless necessary, since his/her perceptions will be measured by another instrument.

Please do not begin observing until the meeting has been in progress for 30 minutes. The observation period will be approximately 1 hour. During that time you will rate each of the 14 items according to two scales. Scale #1 is a measure of frequency; scale #2 is a measure of quality.

Scale #1: Frequency Scale

1. completely lacking	The behavior did not occur during the observation period.
2. occasional	The behavior or dimension occurred only occasionally during the observation period.
3. frequent	The behavior or dimension occurred frequently during the observation period.
4. very frequent	The behavior or dimension occurred very frequently during the observation period.

Scale #2: Quality Scale

1. inferior quality	The behavior occurred or the dimension was present, but the quality was judged inferior as related to the intended purpose of the meeting.
2. acceptable quality	The behavior occurred or the dimension was present, and the quality was judged acceptable as related to the intended purpose of the meeting.
3. good quality	The behavior occurred or the dimension was present and the quality was judged good as related to the intended purpose of the meeting.
4. exceptional quality	The behavior occurred or the dimension was present and the quality was judged exceptional as related to the intended purpose of the meeting.

In rating each item it is important to keep in mind that your judgment should be based as much as possible on observable behavior and evident facts.

Please place a "✓" in the appropriate spaces beside each item. At the end of the checklist you will find 4 free response items requiring short written answers.

Section I - Evaluation of the Trainer

	Frequency of Behavior				Quality of Behavior			
	comp. lack.	occas.	freq.	very freq.	inferior	accept.	good	except.
1. The trainer stimulates discussion effectively. The trainer does not simply display the transparencies; he/she initiates the discussion by asking important questions, drawing attention to evocative details in the transparencies, etc.								
2. The trainer appears comfortable in his/her role. He/she has a manner about him/her that makes the parents feel comfortable and relaxed.								
3. The trainer displays the transparencies effectively. Does the trainer display the transparencies in such a manner that all the parents are able to see them easily and clearly.								
4. The trainer paces the discussion effectively. Does the trainer continue with a topic when it is obvious that the parents have nothing more that is important to contribute. Does the trainer move on to new topics too quickly before the parents have had an opportunity to react thoroughly.								

	Frequency of Behavior				Quality of Behavior			
	comp. lack.	occas.	freq.	very freq.	inferior	accept.	good	except.
5. The trainer is flexible. Does the trainer enforce a rigid plan for the meeting or does he/she seem willing to abandon his/her original plan if an important discussion develops.								
6. The trainer encourages parents to express their personal feelings related to the problems they have as parents of exceptional children. The trainer asks questions such as "How do you feel about...., what did you do...." etc.								

Section II - Evaluation of the Transparencies

1. The transparencies stimulate parental response. Parents are anxious to discuss what the transparencies mean to them. The trainer does not seem to be having a difficult time encouraging parents to talk about the transparencies.								
2. Parents could relate their own experiences to the transparencies. Parents readily recalled incidents in their own lives that the transparencies reminded them of.								

	Frequency of Behavior				Quality of Behavior			
	comp. lack.	occas.	freq.	very freq.	inferior	accept.	good	except.
3. Parental response to the transparencies is spontaneous. The parents do not require excessive prodding or questioning by the trainer in order to respond.								
Section III - Evaluation of the Parents								
1. The parents appear interested in the meeting. The parents are discussing issues related to the meeting with each other or with the trainer, the parents are nodding their heads in agreement. The parents are watching the trainer intently.								
2. The parents seem comfortable and at ease with the meeting. Parents are relaxed and are participating in the discussion freely. They do not seem embarrassed or unusually reserved.								
3. The parents express their personal feelings. The parents use sentences that begin "I feel..." They talk about their own experiences, ideas and problems.								

	Frequency of Behavior				Quality of Behavior			
	comp. lack.	occas.	freq.	very freq.	inferior	accept.	good	except.
4. The parents interact with each other. The parents make suggestions to each other based on their own experiences. The parents agree or disagree with each other about similar experiences. The parents offer sympathy or support to each other related to mutual problems.								

Section IV - Free Response Items

1. What aspects of the meeting do you think were most productive? _____

_____

_____

2. What aspects of the meeting do you think were least productive? _____

_____

_____

3. What suggestions do you have for improving the meetings? _____

_____

_____

4. What comments do you have that might be of particular interest to the project director? _____

_____

APPENDIX H

Original Form

Parent Education
Program
Parent Opinionnaire

Trainer Name: _____ Date: _____

The purpose of this opinionnaire is to determine your perception of the Parent Education Program. The information obtained from your answers along with the answers from other parents will be used to improve the program. Therefore, you are encouraged to consider the questions carefully and to answer them as honestly as you can.

Please indicate your answer to each question by circling the number beside your choice. For some questions you will be asked to provide short written answers.

Section I - Background Information

1. What is your sex?

   (1) male
   (2) female

2. What is your age?

   (1) 20-25 (4) 35-40
   (2) 26-30 (5) 40-45
   (3) 30-35 (6) over 45

3. How many children are in your family? _____

4. What are their ages? _____

5. How many of these children are handicapped? _____

6. How old is/are the handicapped child/children? _____

7. Do both you and your spouse hold jobs outside the home?

   (1) yes
   (2) no

Section II - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Meetings

1. The meetings were more valuable to me than most other types of parent meetings I have attended.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

2. The meetings helped me become a better parent to my exceptional child.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

3. I would recommend meetings of this type to a friend or relative who is the parent of an exceptional child.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

4. I am sorry that the meetings have ended.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

5. In general, I found the meetings boring.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

6. What did you like most about the meetings?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. What did you dislike most about the meetings?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Do you have any suggestions for improving the meetings?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section III - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Transparencies

1. I found it easy to relate my own personal experiences to the transparencies.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

2. The meetings could have been conducted just as well without the transparencies.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

3. I thought the transparencies were a good way to get the conversation going.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

4. If you can recall any transparencies that fit the following descriptions, please list them.

   a. Very stimulating; most parents wanted to talk about experiences they had that were related to these transparencies.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

   b. Boring; none of the parents had experiences they wanted to discuss that were related to these transparencies.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

   c. Offensive; the transparencies angered, disgusted or embarrassed you.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section IV - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Affective Measures

1. The meetings have helped me to realize that parents of exceptional children can be a great help to each other.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

2. I think I can be of valuable help to parents of exceptional children because of the experiences I have had with my own child.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

3. The parents who attended these meetings have actively shared with each other their feelings and ideas about parenting an exceptional child.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

4. It was easier for me to express my personal feelings about parenting an exceptional child during the final few meetings than it was during the earlier meetings.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

5. I discuss my personal feelings about being the parent of an exceptional child more now as a result of these meetings.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

6. As a result of these meetings, I find it easier to cope with the problems related to being the parent of an exceptional child.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

7. My spouse and I exchange feelings about being the parents of an exceptional child more as a result of the meetings.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

Section V - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Resource Directory

1. I have familiarized myself with the information contained in the resource directory.

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

2. The information contained in the resource directory has been useful to me.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

3. I know much more about local, state and national resources available to me now than I did before the meeting.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

4. Have you used any of the resources you discovered through the resource directory?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) I have not examined the directory yet.

5. Have you talked to parents of exceptional children not participating in the meetings about the resource directory?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) I have not examined the directory yet.

   (4) I haven't had the opportunity to meet with parents of exceptional children other than those who participated in the meetings.

6. Do you have any suggestions for improving or adding to the resource directory?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section VI - Evaluation of Behavior Modification Components

1. Did you, with the trainer's help, design a behavior modification program for your child?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

2. Did you, with the trainer's help, implement the program you designed for your child?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

3. Were you satisfied with the results of the behavior modification program you designed and implemented?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) I did not design and implement a behavior modification program.

4. If you have not already done so, do you plan to design and implement a behavior modification program with your child?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) Unsure

5. Do you plan to continue designing and implementing behavior modification programs with your child?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) Unsure

6. Would you recommend behavior modification programs to a friend or relative as a method for solving behavior problems they may have with their children?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) Unsure

Section VII - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Trainer

1. In your opinion, did the trainer give you satisfactory answers to the specific questions you asked about your child's handicap?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) I did not ask any specific questions about my child's handicap.

2. Do you feel that at most of the meetings the conversation was dominated by a few talkative parents?

   (1) Yes.

   (2) No

   (3) Unsure

3. Do you think the trainer respected points of view other than her/his own?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) Unsure

4. Do you think the trainer was effective in encouraging reticent parents to contribute to the conversation at the meeting?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) Unsure

   (4) None of the parents were particularly reticent.

Revised Form

Parent Education Program Parent Opinionnaire

Trainer Name:_____ Date:_____

The purpose of this opinionnaire is to determine your perception of the Parent Education Program. The information obtained from your answers along with the answers from other parents will be used to improve the program. Therefore, you are encouraged to consider the questions carefully and to answer them as honestly as you can.

Please indicate your answer to each question by circling the number beside your choice. For some questions you will be asked to provide short written answers.

Section I - Background Information

1. What is your sex?
   (1) male
   (2) female

2. What is your age?

   (1) 20-25 (4) 35-40
   (2) 26-30 (5) 40-45
   (3) 30-35 (6) over 45

3. How many children are in your family?_____

4. What are their ages?_____

5. How many of these children are handicapped?_____

6. How old is/are the handicapped child/children?_____

7. How would you classify your child's handicap?

   (1) physical (2) intellectual
   (3) emotional (4) other

   If you chose category #4, please explain briefly.

   _____

   _____

Section II - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Meetings

1. The meetings were more valuable to me than most other types of parent meetings I have attended.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

2. The meetings helped me become a better parent to my exceptional child.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

3. I would recommend meetings of this type to a friend or relative who is the parent of an exceptional child.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

4. I am sorry that the meetings have ended.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

5. In general, I found the meetings boring.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

6. What did you like most about the meetings?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. What did you dislike most about the meetings?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Do you have any suggestions for improving the meetings?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section III - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Transparencies

1. I found it easy to relate my own personal experiences to the transparencies.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

2. The meetings could have been conducted just as well without the transparencies.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

3. I thought the transparencies were a good way to get the conversation going.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

4. The transparencies were relevant to the problems encountered with my child's type of handicap.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

Section IV - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Affective Measures

1. The meetings have helped me to realize that parents of exceptional children can be a great help to each other.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

2. I think I can be of valuable help to parents of exceptional children because of the experiences I have had with my own child.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

3. The parents who attended these meetings have actively shared with each other their feelings and ideas about parenting an exceptional child.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

4. It was easier for me to express my personal feelings about parenting an exceptional child during the final few meetings than it was during the earlier meetings.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

5. I discuss my personal feelings about being the parent of an exceptional child more now as a result of these meetings.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

6. As a result of these meetings, I find it easier to cope with the problems related to being the parent of an exceptional child.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

7. My spouse and I exchange feelings about being the parents of an exceptional child more as a result of the meetings.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

Section V - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Resource Directory

1. I have familiarized myself with the information contained in the resource directory.

   (1) Yes
   (2) No

2. The information contained in the resource directory has been useful to me.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

3. I know much more about local, state and national resources available to me now than I did before the meeting.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

4. Have you used any of the resources you discovered through the resource directory?

   (1) Yes
   (2) No
   (3) I have not examined the directory yet.

5. Have you talked to parents of exceptional children not participating in the meetings about the resource directory.

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) I have not examined the directory yet.

   (4) I haven't had the opportunity to meet with parents of exceptional children other than those who participated in the meetings.

6. Do you have any suggestions for improving or adding to the resource directory?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section VI - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Trainer

1. In your opinion, did the trainer give you satisfactory answers to the specific questions you asked about your child's handicap?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) I did not ask any specific questions about my child's handicap.

2. Do you feel that at most of the meetings the conversation was dominated by a few talkative parents?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) Unsure

3. Do you think the trainer respected points of view other than her/his own?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) Unsure

4. Do you think the trainer was effective in encouraging reticent parents to contribute to the conversation at the meeting?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) Unsure

   (4) None of the parents were particularly reticent.

APPENDIX I

Original Form

Parent Education Program Trainer Opinionnaire

Trainer Name: _____ Date: _____

The purpose of this opinionnaire is to determine your perception of the Parent Education Program. The information obtained from your answers along with the answers from other trainers will be used to improve the program. Therefore, you are encouraged to consider the questions carefully and to answer them as honestly as you can.

Please indicate your answer to each question by circling the number beside your choice. For some questions you will be asked to provide short written answers.

Section I - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Training Session(s)

1. The training session(s) was (were) good preparation for me to act as facilitator at the parent meetings.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

2. I could have conducted the meetings just as well without the training session(s).

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

3. I needed more preparation for the parent meetings than the training session(s) gave me.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

4. It would have been difficult for me to conduct the meetings if I had not attended the training session(s).

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

5. What would you do to change the training session(s) so that it (they) would have prepared you better for the role of facilitator at the parent meetings?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section II - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Manual

1. The manual was helpful in planning the meetings.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

2. The manual was helpful in conducting the meetings.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

3. I could have planned the meetings just as well without referring to the manual.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

4. I could have conducted the meetings just as well without referring to the manual.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

5. The manual helped me gain insight into the problem of parents of exceptional children.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

6. I thought the manual was written in clear, easy to understand language.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

7. The suggestions for use of the transparencies were helpful to me.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

8. The suggestions for helping parents design behavior modification programs for their children were helpful to me.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

9. The manual suggestions for the use of transparencies did not help stimulate conversation with the group of parents I was working with.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

10. What specific suggestions do you have for improving the manual?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section III - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Transparencies

1. The parents found it easy to relate their own experiences to the transparencies.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

2. The parents found the transparencies confusing.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

3. In general, the transparencies were an effective means of stimulating parents' responses.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

4. In general, the parents seemed bored by the use of the transparencies.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

5. If you can recall any transparencies that fit the following descriptions, please list them.

   a. Very evocative, stimulated a great deal of parental response.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

b. Boring; parents seemed totally disinterested in subject.

c. Offensive, produced a negative reaction; parents were angered or made uncomfortable by the transparency.

Section IV - Evaluation of Parental Performance

1. Did parents ask you for specific information about their child's handicap?

   (1) More than 1/2 the parents did.
   (2) Less than 1/2 the parents did.
   (3) None of the parents did.

2. Were you able to give adequate answers to them?

   (1) Always
   (2) Almost Always
   (3) Sometimes
   (4) Never
   (5) Don't know

3. Parents definitely shared their ideas and feelings with each other more during the final few meetings than they did during the earlier meetings.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

4. I could see no change in the parents' willingness to express their personal feelings from the first to the last meeting.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

5. In general most of the parents seemed bored by the meetings.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

6. A few talkative parents seemed to dominate most of the conversation at the meetings.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

7. Even the most reticent parents were expressing their personal feelings by the final meeting.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

8. By the final meeting, most parents were capable of planning their own behavior modification programs.

   (1) True
   (2) False
   (3) Unsure

9. Parents seemed enthusiastic about behavior mo ification techniques they had learned.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

10. Most parents actively planned and implemented behavior modification techniques.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

11. Would you recommend this type of program to a friend or relative with a handicapped child?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) Unsure

Revised Form

Parent Education Program Trainer Opinionnaire

Trainer name: _____ Date: _____

The purpose of this opinionnaire is to determine your perception of the Parent Education Program. The information obtained from your answers along with the answers from other trainers will be used to improve the program. Therefore, you are encouraged to consider the questions carefully and to answer them as honestly as you can.

Please indicate your answer to each question by circling the number beside your choice. For some questions you will be asked to provide short written answers.

Section I - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Training Session(s)

1. The training session(s) was (were) good preparation for me to act as facilitator at the parent meeting.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

2. I could have conducted the meetings just as well without the training sessions(s).

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

3. I needed more preparation for the parent meetings than the training session(s) gave me.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

4. It would have been difficult for me to conduct the meetings if I had not attended the training session(s).

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

5. What would you do to change the training session(s) so that it (they) would have prepared you better for the role of facilitator at the parent meetings?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section II - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Manual

1. The manual was halpful in planning the meetings.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

2. The manual was helpful in conducting the meetings.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

3. I could have planned the meetings just as well without referring to the manual.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

4. I could have conducted the meetings just as well without referring to the manual.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

5. The manual helped me gain insight into the problem of parents of exceptional children.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

6. I thought the manual was written in clear, easy to understand language.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

7. The suggestions for use of the transparencies were helpful to me.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

8. The manual suggestions for the use of transparencies did not help stimulate conversation with the group of parents I was working with.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

9. What specific suggestions do you have for improving the manual?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section III - Evaluation of Parent Education Program Transparencies

1. The parents found it easy to relate their own experiences to the transparencies.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

2. The parents found the transparencies confusing.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

3. In general, the transparencies were an effective means of stimulating parents' responses.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

4. In general, the parents seemed bored by the use of the transparencies.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

5. The transparencies were relevant to the problems encountered with the type of handicap presented by the majority of the group.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

Section IV - Evaluation of Parental Performance

1. Did parents ask you for specific information about their child's handicap?

   (1) More than 1/2 the parents did.

   (2) Less than 1/2 the parents did.

   (3) None of the parents did.

2. Were you able to give adequate answers to them?

   (1) Always

   (2) Almost Always

   (3) Sometimes

   (4) Never

   (5) Don't Know

3. Parents definitely shared their ideas and feelings with each other more during the final few meetings than they did during the earlier meetings.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

4. I could see no change in the parents' willingness to express their personal feelings from the first to the last meeting.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

5. In general, most of the parents seemed bored by the meetings.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

6. A few talkative parents seemed to dominate most of the conversation at the meetings.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

7. Even the most reticent parents were expressing their personal feelings by the final meetings.

   (1) True

   (2) False

   (3) Unsure

8. Did you discuss the Resource Directory with the parents?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

9. Did most of the parents familiarize themselves with the Resource Directory?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) Unsure

10. Would you recommend this program to a friend or a relative with a handicapped child?

   (1) Yes

   (2) No

   (3) Unsure

APPENDIX J

An Evaluative Study of the Longitudinal Effect of the CREC Parent Education Program "Parenting and the Exceptional Child"

-Final Report-

Prepared by

Linda L. Cook
Laboratory of Psychometric and Evaluative Research
School of Education
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

March 22, 1976

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 1

1.1 A Brief Description of the "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" Program 1

1.2 Statement of the Purpose of the Evaluation 1

2. Methodology 2

2.1 Description of Sample 2

2.2 Experimental Design 2

2.3 Administration of Data Collection Instruments 3

2.4 Limitations of the Methodology 3

3. Analysis of the Parent Education Program Longitudinal Opinionnaire 3

3.1 Instrumentation 3

3.2 Results 3

4. Conclusions 5

References 7

Appendix A-Cover Letter

Appendix B-Parent Education Program Longitudinal Opinionnaire

Appendix C-Revised Cover Letter

Preface

During the Spring of 1975, the Capitol Region Education Council "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" program was implemented in three CREC special education programs; The Day Treatment Service in West Hartford, Tri-Town - Bristol Program and the Tri-Town - Plainville Program. The present evaluative study is concerned with the longitudinal effects of the program implemented at all three of these sites.

The program evaluator would like to express sincere thanks to the program trainers; Ms. Laura Smaus, Ms. Geri McMahon and Mr. Fritz Clymer and also to CREC staff member Ms. Cathy Hussey. The kind cooperation of those mentioned greatly facilitated the evaluation.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Brief Description of the "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" Program

The development of the program was made possible through an ESEA, Title III grant to the Capitol Region Education Council. The program materials were developed by Dr. Allison Rossett in consultation with parents and educators of exceptional children. The program consists of 45 transparencies and a print trainer's manual and is designed to provide a mediated approach to parent education for parents of children with special needs. The visuals are open ended; they depict parents and children in natural interactions and leave these interactions unresolved. Trainers and parents then utilize the statements, actions and feelings evoked by the transparencies to bring about desired changes in parenting behaviors.

The visuals are accompanied by a detailed trainer and resource manual. Each visual is individually treated; suggested questions, activities and resources relevant to the issue highlighted in the visual are provided. An extensive people, places and print resources listing is also included in the trainer's manual.

1.2 Statement of the Purpose of the Evaluation

The major goals of the CREC program "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" are as follows:

-To encourage parents to gather with other parents of exceptional children.

-To stimulate discussion of the nature and impact of exceptionality on the parents of exceptional children.

-To encourage discussion of the parents' feelings about being the parents of exceptional children.

-To use this affective discussion to stimulate parent request for cognitive information about their child's exceptionality.

-To organize and systematize parents serving as resources for each other in effective parenting and learning within the home.

-To suggest family situations and decision points as opportunities for parent role playing and behavior rehearsal of more effective parenting behaviors.

-To suggest options for parenting behaviors in response to the demands of various exceptionalities.

-To provide stimulus and direction for trainers to work with parents in the design of behavior modification programs for use with exceptional children, where appropriate to the program.

-To familiarize parents with local, state, and national resources for parents of exceptional children.

It has been previously established, that the major goals of the program were met (Rossett [1975]). The purpose of the present evaluation was to determine, relative to these goals, the lasting effect of the program on the participants' behavior.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Description of the Sample

The sample consisted of 13 parents of children enrolled in educational facilities under the direction of the Capitol Region Education Council. These parents were predominantly middle class, white, semi-urban residents. A variety of handicaps including emotional, intellectual and physical were represented by the children.

100% of the parents sampled were female. 60% of these parents were in the 40-45 year age group. The average number of children per family was 3.5 and the average age of the handicapped child was 10.7 years.

The parents were members of three separate parent groups, each being facilitated by a CREC staff member serving as program trainer. The 13 parents sampled represent 37% of the total membership of these three groups.

2.2 Experimental Design

A mail survey technique was used for data collection. The major advantages and disadvantages of this technique are discussed by Wallace (1954). The major advantage of using this approach to data collection for the present evaluation was that it afforded the opportunity to reach a maximum number of parents at a minimum cost. Other advantages of the technique are the lessening of interviewer effect and also the maximization of privacy of response. The major disadvantage of mail surveys is non-response. This was not a problem with the present evaluation. Ten opinionnaires or 77% of the opinionnaires originally mailed were returned. This is quite remarkable considering that the expected response to subjective mail questionnaires is usually between 10 and 25%.

2.3 Administration of Data Collection Instrument

Opinionnaires were mailed with enclosed cover letters and stamped addressed envelopes to the 13 participating parents on February 1. A copy of the letter is presented in Appendix A. Appendix B presents a copy of the instrument. The initial mailing resulted in a total response of 68%. A second mailing also enclosing a stamped addressed envelope and a revised cover letter was made on February 14. A copy of the revised cover letter may be found in Appendix C. The second mailing resulted in an additional 2 responses, yielding a total return rate of 77%.

2.4 Limitations of the Methodology

The major limitation of the methodology was lack of randomness of the parent sample. Because of this limitation, generalizations to a population of all parents of all handicapped children must be made with extreme caution.

A second limitation was that the resources available for the evaluation were not sufficient to enable an extensive validation of the data collection instrument. Thus, one cannot be absolutely sure that the instrument measured what it was intended to measure. However, it can be said that the instrument had a high degree of face validity (Cronbach [1971]).

Another limitation was that the rate of return of the Opinionnaire was not 100%. It is quite possible that those parents not returning opinionnaires differed in some unknown manner from those responding, thus introducing some type of bias in sampling. However, because the response rate was so high, this bias is most probably of little importance.

3. ANALYSIS OF THE PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAM LONGITUDINAL OPINIONNAIRES

3.1 Instrumentation

The development of the Parent Education Program Longitudinal Opinionnaire was based on methodologies discussed by Miller (1970).

The instrument consisted of 5 items soliciting background information for the study, and 10 items assessing the longitudinal effects of program participation. As mentioned previously, a copy of the instrument is presented in Appendix B.

3.2 Results

The results of the Parent Education Program Longitudinal Opinionnaire are summarized in Table 1. These results indicate that 80% of the parents felt that they were sorry the meetings had ended, and

Table 1

Summary of Responses to Parent Education Program Longitudinal Opinionnaire

Section	Item No.	Responses** (N=10)		
		True	False	Unsure
II	1.	80		20
	2.	80	10	10
	3.	30	30	40
	4.	70	10	20
	5.	40	30	30
	6.	10	50	40
	7.	70	10	20
	8.	40	20	40
	9.	80	20	
	10.	20	50	30

** responses are given in percentages

that if they had the opportunity, they would attend similar meetings now. 80% of the parents also said that they had told others (friends, relatives, other parents of exceptional children) about their experiences at the meetings. 70% of the parents felt that the information they had gained from the meetings concerning their child's handicap had been a help to them. 70% felt that as a result of the meetings it is now easier for them to exchange ideas with the parents of other exceptional children. 40% of the parents felt that as a result of the meetings, it is easier to exchange ideas about parenting a handicapped child with their spouse. 40% felt that as a result of the meetings, they thought they had become better parents of their exceptional children. 30% of the parents reported that they are continuing to use behavior modification techniques with their children, 20% reported that they have used the information and insights gained from the meetings to help parents of other exceptional children and 10% reported that since the meetings, they have used information contained in the Resource Directory.

4. CONCLUSIONS

It can be concluded from the parents' responses, that they considered the meetings a satisfying and valuable experience and also that the major goals of the program of imparting cognitive information as well as promoting parent-parent interaction have been accomplished and have had a lasting effect upon the parents. The fact that the parents have not continued to use behavior modification techniques with their children or to use the Resource Directory to any great extent is not difficult to understand. The initial evaluation of the program (Rossett [1975]) revealed that neither of these program components had been emphasized by the trainers during any of the meetings. The observation that only 40% of the parents stated that as a result of the meetings their interaction with their spouses had improved, should not necessarily be interpreted as indicating that the program is not effective in this area. It is quite likely that most parents considered their interaction good before attending any meetings. If parents felt that it was easy to communicate with their respective spouses prior to meeting attendance, it is unlikely that they would feel that attending the meetings had made this communication process easier. This explanation is also quite plausible for the 40% "true" responses to the item which asked if parents felt that as a result of the meetings they had become better parents to their exceptional children.

The responses to item 10, indicating that only 20% of the parents have used information and insights gained at the meetings to help parents of other exceptional children, should also not be interpreted as conclusive evidence that the program has failed in this area. It is most probable that only a few parents have actually had the opportunity to help other parents of exceptional children. Had more parents been presented with this opportunity it is likely that more would have responded positively to item 10.

In summary, it can be said that the "Parenting and the Exceptional Child" program has had a positive and lasting effect on parents who regularly attended the meetings and that these parents considered the meetings valuable and would like to have the opportunity of attending meetings of this type in the future.

References

Cronbach, L.J., Test validation. in Thorndike, R.L., (Ed.) Educational Measurement, 2nd Ed., Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1971.

Miller, D.C., Handbook of research design and social measurement, 2nd Ed., New York: David McKay Co., Inc. 1970.

Rossett, A., Parenting and the exceptional child, final report. Capitol Region Education Council: Windsor, Connecticut, 1975.

Wallace, D., A case for-and against-mail questionnaires, Public Opinion Quarterly, 18, 40-52, 1954.

Capitol Region Education Council
800 Cottage Grove Road, Bldg 2
Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002
Area Code 203 243-8923

APPENDIX A

In the Spring of 1975, you were kind enough to participate in the evaluation of one of the Capitol Region Education Council's programs, for the parents of exceptional children. You will recall that the program involved a series of meetings, at which transparencies depicting exceptional children in various situations were discussed.

As a final step in the evaluation, we are attempting to assess the long-term effect of the parent meetings. Enclosed you will find an opinionnaire to be used for this purpose.

The number of parents participating in the original evaluation was very small, for this reason it is essential that we have 100% return of the opinionnaires. Please, fill out and return the opinionnaire to us as soon as possible; it will take only a few minutes. Could you do it now? Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

John J. Allison, Jr.
Executive Director

ckm

Capitol Region Education Council
800 Cottage Grove Road - Bldg. 2
Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002

Parent Education Program Longitudinal Opinionnaire

Date: _____

The purpose of this opinionnaire is to determine the long-range effects of the parent education program you participated in. The information obtained anonymously from your answers along with the answers from other parents will be used to improve the program. Therefore, you are encouraged to consider the questions carefully and to answer them as honestly as you can.

Section I - Background Information

Please indicate your answer to each question by circling the number beside your choice.

1. What is your sex? (1) male (2) female

2. What is your age? (1) 20-25 (2) 26-30 (3) 30-35 (4) 36-40 (5) 40-45 (6) over 45

3. How many children are in your family? _____

4. What is/are the age/ages of the handicapped child/children? _____

5. What type of handicap does your child have? _____

Section II - Longitudinal Effect of Parent Education Program

		Check Appropriate Box		
		True (1)	False (2)	Unsure (3)
1. I am sorry that the meetings have ended.	1.			
2. If I had the opportunity, I would attend similar meetings now.	2.			
3. As a result of the meetings, I have been using behavior modification techniques with my child.	3.			
4. The information I gained, from the meetings, concerning my child's handicap has been a help to me.	4.			
5. As a result of the meetings, it is easier for my spouse and I to share our feelings about parenting a handicapped child.	5.			
6. Since the meetings, I have used information contained in the Resource Directory.	6.			
7. As a result of the meetings, it has become easier for me to exchange ideas and feelings about parenting an exceptional child with the parents of other exceptional children.	7.			
8. As a result of the meetings, I think I				

Section I - Background Information

Please indicate your answer to each question by circling the number beside your choice.

1. What is your sex? (1) male (2) female

2. What is your age? (1) 20-25 (2) 26-30 (3) 30-35 (4) 36-40 (5) 40-45 (6) over 45

3. How many children are in your family?_____

4. What is/are the age/ages of the handicapped child/children?_____

5. What type of handicap does your child have?_____

Section II - Longitudinal Effect of Parent Education Program

		Check Appropriate Box		
		True (1)	False (2)	Unsure (3)
1.	I am sorry that the meetings have ended. 1.			
2.	If I had the opportunity, I would attend similar meetings now. 2.			
3.	As a result of the meetings, I have been using behavior modification techniques with my child. 3.			
4.	The information I gained, from the meetings, concerning my child's handicap has been a help to me. 4.			
5.	As a result of the meetings, it is easier for my spouse and I to share our feelings about parenting a handicapped child. 5.			
6.	Since the meetings, I have used information contained in the Resource Directory. 6.			
7.	As a result of the meetings, it has become easier for me to exchange ideas and feelings about parenting an exceptional child with the parents of other exceptional children. 7.			
8.	As a result of the meetings, I think I have become a better parent to my exceptional child. 8.			
9.	I have told others (friends, relatives, other parents of exceptional children) about my experiences at the meetings. 9.			
10.	I have used the information and insights I gained from the meetings to help parents of other exceptional children. 10.			

Thank you for completing this opinionnaire. Please, return it to me in the enclosed, stamped envelope.

APPENDIX C

Capitol Region Education
Council
800 Cottage Grove Road, Bldg. 2
Bloomfield, Conn. 06002

You were recently contacted regarding an evaluation of one of the Capitol Region Education Council's programs you participated in during Spring 1975. You will recall that the program involved a series of meetings at which transparencies depicting exceptional children in various situations were discussed.

It was explained in the previous letter, that the number of parents participating in the original evaluation was very small and that for this reason it is essential that we have 100% return of the opinionnaires. As yet, not all parents have returned their opinionnaires. If you have not returned yours, please take the time to fill out the enclosed opinionnaire and return it to me in the stamped addressed envelope enclosed for this purpose. If you have already returned your opinionnaire, please disregard this letter. Thankyou for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Linda L. Cook
Director of Evaluation
PEP Project